Journal of Thought

Douglas J. Simpson, Texas Tech University, Editor
Alan H. Jones, Caddo Gap Press, Publisher

Volume 42, Numbers 3 & 4

Fall-Winter 2007

Journal of Thought

Published Quarterly by Caddo Gap Press
with Sponsorship
of the College of Education at Texas Tech University
James Van Patten, Founding Editor, 1966

Editorial Staff:
Douglas J. Simpson, Editor, Texas Tech University
Sally McMillan, Associate Editor, Texas Tech University
Judy Aycock Simpson, Associate Editor, Texas Tech University
William Hull, Senior Editorial Assistant, Texas Tech University
Jacqueline Romano, Editorial Assistant, Texas Tech University
Everett Egginton, Associate Editor, International Issues, New Mexico State University
John Keedy, Associate Editor, Leadership Issues, University of Louisville
Ann Larson, Associate Editor, Curriculum Issues, University of Louisville
Phyllis Metcalf-Turner, Associate Editor, Diversity Issues, Illinois State University

Editorial Review Board
Tunde Adeleke, Iowa State University; Heesoon Bai, Simon Fraser University; Sue Books, State University of New York at New Paltz; Jeanne Connell, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Bernardo Gallegos, Washington State University; William Hare, Mount Saint Vincent University; Sue Ellen Henry, Bucknell University; Richard Lyons, University of Massachusetts-Lowell; Juan S. Muñoz, Texas Tech University; John P. Portelli, University of Toronto; Jose Alejandro Ramirez, Universidad de las Americas, Puebla; A. G. Rud, Purdue University; Sam Stack, West Virginia University; Shirley R. Steinberg, McGill University; Barbara S. Stengel, Millersville University; Sofía Villenas, Cornell University; Alan Wieder, University of South Carolina.

Editorial Review Panel
Mary Frances Agnello, Texas Tech University; Connie Anderson, Texas Tech University; Jan Armstrong, University of New Mexico; Lars G. Bjork, University of Kentucky; Bonita Butner, University of Missouri, Kansas City; Joseph Claudet, Texas Tech University; Steve Crooks, Texas Tech University; Joseph L. DeVitis, Georgia College and State University; Lee S. Duemer, Texas Tech University; James S. Kaminsky, Auburn University; Kimberly Lenease King, Auburn University; Aretha Faye Marbley, Texas Tech University; Steve Miller, University of Louisville; Luis F. Miron, Florida International University; Barbara Morgan-Fleming, Texas Tech University; Sherrie Reynolds, Texas Christian University; Jennifer A. Vadeboncoeur, University of British Columbia.

Publisher: Alan H. Jones, Caddo Gap Press

Copyright 2007 by Caddo Gap Press

3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275, San Francisco, California 94118 U.S.A.
Telephone: 415/666-3012; Fax: 415/666-3552; E-mail: info@caddogap.com
ISSN 0022-5231
Annual Subscriptions: $50 individuals; $100 institutions

(see ordering information on page 144)

Journal of Thought

A Journal of Critical Reflection on Educational Issues

The ***Journal of Thought*** is a quarterly publication devoted to the reflective examination of educational issues and problems from the perspective of different disciplines and interdisciplinary lenses. The ***Journal*** welcomes scholar's work that represent varied viewpoints, methodologies, disciplines, cultures, and nationalities as it seeks to treat the most comprehensive issues and problems confronting education throughout the world. Essays that develop a reasoned and supported argument, that offer insightful analysis and critiques of other's arguments, or that report on significant research of interest to the field are welcomed. The editorial goal is to stimulate a warranted synthesis of diverse viewpoints and to encourage interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary dialogue.

The ***Journal*** is published by Caddo Gap Press, San Francisco, California. Editorial correspondence and inquiries should be addressed to Douglas J. Simpson, Editor, ***Journal of Thought***, College of Education, Texas Tech University, Box 41071, Lubbock, Texas 79409-1071, U.S.A.

All manuscripts should be submitted electronically to **doug.simpson@ttu.edu** and **william.hull@ttu.edu**. The proposed article and notes or references should not ordinarily exceed 20 double-spaced pages. Manuscripts must be original and not have appeared in print previously. Since the ***Journal of Thought*** is a refereed, peer-reviewed publication, manuscripts are submitted for blind review to two or more reviewers. When sending materials, two files are needed: (1) the title page with author identifying information, email and regular addresses, and telephone number and (2) the manuscript itself. Complete, formatted references, text citations, and notes should be provided according to the ***Chicago Manual of Style*** (15th Edition) or the ***Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*** (5th Edition). If the ***Chicago Manual of Style*** is used, the author-date-page system is strongly encouraged, i.e., a text citation with author-date-page given, e.g. (Dewey 1938, 111). See ***Chicago Manual of Style*** page 597. When the ***APA Manual*** is used, *always state the page number(s)* in a text citation, e.g., (Dewey, 1938, p. 111). See ***APA Manual*** page 118 Quotation 1.

The opinions and views expressed in the ***Journal*** are those of the individual authors and are not to be construed as the opinion of the editor, the associate editors, the publisher, the editorial review board, the editorial review panel, Texas Tech University, or Caddo Gap Press. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher.

Subscription rates to ***Journal of Thought*** are $50 annually for individuals and $100 annually for institutions and libraries. Subscribers outside of the United States must add $60 per year to cover additional postage. Back issues are $25 per copy. All subscriptions and single-copy orders should be addressed and payable to Caddo Gap Press, 3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275, San Francisco, California 94118, U.S.A. (telephone 415/666-3012; fax 415/666-3552; e-mail

Contents

Editor's Introduction:
In Search of the Common Good 3
Sally McMillan

Critical Constructivism
for Teaching and Learning
in a Democratic Society 9
Michael Bentley, Stephen C. Fleury, & Jim Garrison

A Reflective Discourse on Science Learning
and the Merits of Simulation 23
Janet Kelly, Curtis Bradley,
Jonathan Gratch, & Robert Maninger

Students as Designers
of Their Own Life Curricula:
Reconstruction of Experience in Education
through Thoughtful Deliberative Action 39
Vincent E. Izuegbu

A Case against Heightened Self-Esteem
as an Educational Aim 55
Jack Martin

Resisting Bureaucracy:
A Case Study of Home Schooling 71
Jean A. Patterson, Ian Gibson, Andrew Koenigs,
Michael Maurer, Gladys Ritterhouse,
Charles Stockton, & Mary Jo Taylor

Walter Kaufmann
and the Future of the Humanities 87
David Pickus

Towards a Theory of Work Satisfaction:
An Examination of Karl Marx
and Frederick Herzberg 105
Richard G. Lyons

Aurobindo's Thought
and Holistic Global Education 115
Stephen R. White

Book Review:
Educating Citizens for Global Awareness
Nel Noddings, Editor 133
Reviewed by Reese H. Todd

Book Review:
Fundamentals of Curriculum:
Passion and Professionalism
by Decker Walker 137
Reviewed by William Hull

Questions about *Journal of Thought* 8

Contributing Authors 141

Subscription Form 114

Editorial Staff,
Editorial Review Board,
& Editorial Review Panel ..... inside front cover

Editorial Statement
and Guidelines for Authors ..... inside back cover

Editor's Introduction:
In Search of the Common Good

Sally McMillan
Editor, Journal of Thought
Texas Tech University

While teaching a certification course entitled *Issues and Reforms in American Secondary Schools*, I sought to contextualize some of our country's current schooling issues with the help of the Public Broadcasting System's popular video *The Merrow Report: In Schools We Trust.* At the heart of John Merrow's historical documentary are two questions: What is the purpose of public schools? And who determines their direction? While Merrow's documentary discusses a broad array of cultural and political influences within the 150 or so years that communities within the United States have provided public schooling, one influence remains as a pervasively "felt presence" throughout the report. At times it is presented as the dominant educational stance within a particular era, while at other times it appears to have been almost eclipsed by a call to move "back to the basics" or towards an emphasis on increased economic security.

However, this "felt presence" is a reality—that in spite of often concentrated efforts to do so—is difficult to ignore. No matter what various politicians or citizen groups have argued should be the purpose of the public schools, the fact remains that our educational systems operate within a country that claims a democratic form of government; the very nature of which indicates the necessity of providing educational opportunities for all. To divorce the purposes of our public schools from our political identity is a dangerous thing. To ignore the connections between the public schools and democracy is to make those schools expendable—to ignore the common good. Therefore, rather than argue about whether or not schools should "inculcate students with democratic

values," we should focus on exploring the ways in which our schools and society might move beyond narrowly individualistic perceptions of what contributing to a democracy can mean.

Although it would be a mistake to reduce this issue's authors' meaning-making solely to an exploration of democracy, their writings do contribute to an increased understanding of what educating towards and contributing to the common good can mean. Among others, this issue grapples with democracy-related questions such as: What does it mean to implement effective instruction that honors the needs of all individuals within science classrooms? What are some of the ways, in which we can equip students to act as effective citizens in an era of globalization? What can educational researchers, teachers, and administrators learn about the common good from groups who have left public schools for other educational options? And in what ways do the ethical considerations that contribute to American perceptions of work, tell us something about the place of community in relation to individual interests and economic production within our society? Although diverse in content, each incorporates a "felt presence" that is uniquely democratic; a concern for the common good is pervasive.

Five of this issue's eight articles deal directly with educational theory and practice in ways that also connect to life and growth within a democratic society. In "Critical Constructivism for Teaching and Learning in a Democratic Society," Michael Bentley, Stephen C. Fleury, and Jim Garrison point out that the version of constructivism that has been most widely accepted among mainstream teacher educators has been "trivialized," in that it is often devoid of reflection, social consciousness, and democratic citizenship. The authors caution that when constructivism is decontextualized in this way, the danger exists that pre-service teachers will view constructivism as just one more teaching technique; which, in turn, will put them at risk of "fail[ing] to become aware of the political consequences of particular pedagogical decisions." Although careful to explain that recipe approaches to teaching a critical constructivism do not exist, the authors describe process-oriented frameworks that often lead pre-service science and social studies teachers towards a critical understanding of constructivism and its potentially positive role in educating for the common good.

Also emphasizing constructivist theory/practice is the article "A Reflective Discourse on Science Learning and the Merits of Simulation." Janet Kelly, Curtis Bradley, Jonathan Gratch, and Robert Maninger, seek to equip science teachers to act as "change agents" within their own classroom communities through the use of well-designed simulations that act as complements to laboratory experiences.

Reminiscent of Deweyan notions of experience and educational growth, Vincent E. Izegbu's "Students as Designers of their own Life Curricula: Reconstruction of Experience in Education through Thoughtful Deliberative Action" depicts some of the ways in which teachers can empower their students by constructing a democratic classroom environment through enacting a "curriculum of life." Izegbu's piece demonstrates that working in concert, teachers and students can "broaden the conception of curriculum to include life experiences in a way that interweaves school and outside school curriculum in classrooms." What is especially promising about his life curriculum is that it not only equips students to take responsibility for their own learning and enables them to make informed choices, but it also actively integrates curricula with their lived experiences. Curriculum cannot be separated from what Izegbu describes as "deep seated meaning that informs behavior and builds character through skills, knowledge, and dispositions acquired in life." Students are prepared, then, to contribute to a democratic society in deeply meaningful ways.

A fourth article dealing directly with some of the ways in which educational practice and theory influence the common good is Jack Martin's "A Case Against Heightened Self-Esteem as an Educational Aim." He notes that in spite of the fact that there is little research-based support for the notion that enhancing students' self-esteem will reap positive results, it remains a current educational emphasis. Although the history of this emphasis has been rather short, Martin is able to trace what he cites as an "erosion of social, political, and moral considerations" within those theories and programs that support promoting self-esteem as an educational goal. Central to his concern is the idea that an undue focus on enhancing students' self-esteem will be incompatible with the goal of helping students to develop social perspectives that are necessary for their development as productive citizens.

Also concerned with curricula and educational structures is the article "Resisting Bureaucracy: A Case Study of Home Schooling." Rather than marginalize home schooling families through the assumption that they have "abandoned" both public schooling and the public good, the authors—Jean A. Patterson, Ian Gibson, Andrew Koenigs, Michael Maurer, Gladys Ritterhouse, Charles Stockton, and Mary Jo Taylor—contend that insights received from home school families hold the potential to disrupt "the bureaucratic assumptions that underlie public education," thereby providing educators with "a useful framework for analysis." Not only does their study speak to necessary curricular changes, but it also illustrates the potential effectiveness of dialogic perspectives and practices when working towards the common good.

Author David Pickus illustrates the creative tension that exists when educators work towards a pedagogy that is authentic in terms of dealing with our democratic society's changing perspectives of the value and position of the humanities. In his aptly named article "Walter Kaufmann and the Future of Humanities," Pickus utilizes Kaufmann's (1977) *The Future of Humanities* to inform his own critique of some of the ways in which contemporary pedagogical practices can promote versions of the humanities that have the potential to remain "viable" throughout societal changes. Once again a democratic "felt presence" is evident, in that Pickus repeatedly points to our collective need to reflect on our purposes for education, which is, of course, a consideration of the common good.

Richard G. Lyons' "Towards a Theory of Work Satisfaction: An Examination of Karl Marx and Frederick Herzberg" also contains important considerations for work and education, in that he discusses the ethical considerations that motivate Americans to spend more time working than any other country in the western world. Grappling with Karl Marx's ethical model and Frederick Herzberg's psychological model, Lyons' critique provides readers with insights into some of the complex ways, in which production concerns, individual interests / talents, and democratic concerns (i.e., interest in community issues) intersect to inform Americans' perspectives and choices regarding work. While economic and production concerns play a part, this piece also implicitly indicates that democratic values are a pervasive part of our individual and societal decision making, a felt democratic presence is integral to his critique.

Moving beyond a distinctively American form of citizenship, author Stephen R. White's contribution, "Aurobindo's Thought and Holistic Global Education," takes a decidedly spiritual turn with the purpose of seeking the common good at a global level. Within his opening paragraph, White explains that

> ...humankind now has a collective responsibility to facilitate the construction of a shared global culture through educational socialization. This is particularly true for those of us who are committed to educating toward a future existence where peaceful cooperation and planetary citizenship become dominate values that are held in the same high regard as nationalism and individualism are today.

Describing the life and philosophy of Sri Ghose Aurobindo, White maintains that the renowned sage considered teachers to be leaders or "evolution agents" in a movement towards the common good at a global level. Global unity would be reached as human beings took part in their own evolution through nurturing their collective energy.

Also reflecting democratic concerns, one of this issue's two book

reviews also focuses on promoting the common good at a global level. Reese H. Todd opens her review of Nel Nodding's edited volume *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness* with a telling question:

> In an era of narrowed curriculum, can educators turn away from the notion of citizenship education as preparing students to succeed in a *competitive* world and prepare students, instead, for successful living in a *cooperative* world?

Much like White's interpretation of Aurobindo, Todd reports that the collection of essays within Nodding's book points to teachers as change agents, in that they are the ones best suited "to take the responsibility to create windows to a larger world," and "to reshape understandings of citizenship within the 21st century...."

William Hull's review of Decker Walker's *Fundamentals of Curriculum: Passion and Professionalism* also portrays teachers as potential leaders within democratic societies, in that Walker describes curriculum as "the vehicle through which America's identity is shaped." Not only does Hull's review reveal some of the ways in which Walker links public schools and their associated curricula with the welfare of our democratic society, but it also touches on the evolution of curriculum within American educational history. Reflecting American pragmatism, Walker's text—Hull tells us—provides practical curricular applications for classroom teachers. Democracy's "felt presence" is pervasive throughout the reviewer's book.

Once again, readers of this issue are invited to consider the diverse ways in which our schools and society can join together in an ongoing and vitally necessary search for the common good.

Frequently Asked Questions about Journal of Thought

What kinds of articles are suitable for the *Journal of Thought*?

The *Journal* welcomes scholar's work that represents varied viewpoints, methodologies, disciplines, cultures, and nationalities as it seeks to treat the most comprehensive issues and problems confronting education throughout the world. Essays that develop a reasoned and supported argument, that offer insightful analysis and critiques of other's arguments, or that report on significant research of interest to the field are welcomed. The editorial goal is to stimulate a warranted synthesis of diverse viewpoints and to encourage interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary dialogue.

What manual of style should be used?

Use the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th Edition or the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th Edition, APA). See Submission Guidelines on the inside back cover of this issue for details.

How long does it take for the editors and reviewers to make a decision about a manuscript?

During the academic year, the response time is approximately fourteen to sixteen weeks. Manuscripts submitted in the late spring and summer may take additional time.

—continued on page 54—

Critical Constructivism for Teaching and Learning in a Democratic Society

Michael Bentley
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
Stephen C. Fleury
LeMoyne College
& Jim Garrison
Virginia Tech

Practice is never a simple application of general rules to concrete situations... (Bettancourt, 1993)

We begin with a caveat: We do not believe it is possible to derive any straightforward recipe for teaching practice from constructivism, or any other general theory. Attempts to make recipes out of educational theories tend to make them rigid, languid, and unable to motivate teachers or students. Such has been the fate of constructivism. As an educational reform, constructivism has become inert, merely another detachable means to whatever curriculum ends politicians or educational authorities prescribe. Since our first introduction to it over twenty years ago, we have been generally enthusiastic about the constructivist view of meaning and knowledge creation. Understanding both that knowledge *is* constructed and "how" it is constructed serves to reveal the contingency and contextuality as well as theory- and value-ladenness inherent in knowledge. Theory-ladenness of observation, for example, is a phenomenon that one's observations are influenced in various ways by one's background. In other words, observations and experiences have to be *interpreted* to be meaningful and it is this unavoidable association of a theoretical dimension that represents theory-ladenness. Awareness of these characteristics more readily renders all knowledge claims subject

to deconstruction and reconstruction, an important basis for a more critical, creative, and mindful approaches to teaching and learning.

Excited by the pedagogical possibilities of a constructivist perspective, a group of us worked together to develop what we call "critical constructivism."[1] This expanded idea of constructivism emphasizes understanding the contingent nature of knowledge to induce a more critical reflection about various educational institutions and practices. Thus, despite the nearly wholesale acceptance of a trivialized version of constructivism by mainstream educators, we believe that the ideas of constructivism remain a viable and vibrant tool of responsible critique for teaching and learning in a democratic society. In what follows we take a look at school-based education, and particularly curriculum and instruction in the sciences and social studies, through a critical constructivist lens.

Sadly, the school curriculum often unwittingly presents content in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences as objective and beyond question. The decontextualization of this content conceals any of the contingent circumstances of its construction or curricular representation, as well as the larger sociopolitical and economic conditions upon which it depends. In the process, school knowledge loses contact with the context of the student's everyday life; its reification leads the learner to think that knowledge is simply the property of the sages, rather than a revisable social product of humankind. Thus *reification* and *decontextualization* are two undesirable outcomes of education addressed by critical constructivism, a third being *technocratization*, a process we see in the high-stakes testing movement, by which knowledge is used to serve bureaucratization and results in the deskilling of teachers.

Looking at schooling through critical constructivism we seek to deflate the pretensions of content in the curriculum by exposing it as *contingently constructed*, *contextualized*, and *value-oriented*. This exposure occurs by involving students in examining the processes that originally led to its production as well as to the processes by which it is reproduced via curriculum. We are particularly interested in what we have referred to as the students' *rapport au savoir* (Désautels, Garrison, & Fleury, 1998), that is best understood as "a relation of meaning, and thus of value, between an individual (or a group) and the processes and products of knowledge production" (Charlot, Bautier, and Rochex, 1992, p. 29). Most importantly, we think that attending to these critical aspects of constructivism serves as a constitutive means to the democratic ends of teaching and learning.

We fondly recall the moment in the Wizard of Oz when Toto pulls back the curtain revealing the great and wonderful wizard as merely an ordinary person pulling hidden levers. We would like to teach our own

preservice teachers, experienced teachers, and administrators to pull back the curtains and expose the workings of power over their lives. In turn, they may do the same with their students. In what follows, we share ways we attempt to draw back the veil and why we think the robust form of constructivism we call critical constructivism is helpful to those with similar pedagogical purposes. Towards this end, critical constructivism involves both a more critical understanding of the ideas of constructivism, and takes into account—upfront and explicitly—the social, cultural and political nature of knowledge in the teaching and learning process.

Pedagogy Informed by Critical Constructivism

We try to be careful in our own courses about using the phrase "constructivist teaching" so that our students will not regard constructivism as merely an alternative teaching technique. For example, Windschitl (1999) notes "constructivist teaching is less about the sequencing of events and more about responding to the needs of a situation." (p. 753). This is true, and the reference to "constructivist teaching" reminds us that reifying constructivism as a teaching method is dangerously seductive, and may ultimately hinder a full consideration of the insights and implications critical constructivism might afford. Instead, we point out that the ideas, attitudes, and practices referred to as constructivism are about how humans learn by building knowledge cooperatively through social interaction and the application of prior knowledge (as tools) in a continual interpretation of ongoing experiences. Understanding the import of this theory enables teachers to better choose and direct methods and strategies (Bentley, Ebert, & Ebert, 2007).

Ernst von Glasersfeld reminds us that merely noting that humans construct knowledge does little to transform our ideas or orientation. Constructivism challenges some deep-seated cultural assumptions about the creation and ownership of knowledge, which is why, even while claiming to hold to its precepts, many resist coming to terms with its deeper implications (e.g., the contingency of all knowledge and personal identity construction).

Take the case of the conceptual change model, one of the most popular and widespread applications of constructivism in science education (Osborne & Freyberg, 1985; Posner, Strike, & Gertzog, 1982). In that model, learning is seen as a process of merely deconstructing (or simply destroying) the student's misconceptions and facilitating the reconstruction of the unquestionably correct scientific ones in their place. This is a truncated and incomplete understanding of constructivism that fails to challenge

the nature and assumptions of traditional science education, which disempowers all but a few students (Fleury & Swift, 1989, 1990).

Academic knowledge—the content of the curriculum—is important, but it is just one instrument for helping students emancipate themselves from their own biographies (Désautels, Fleury, & Garrison, 2002). Taking account of students' initial knowledge needs to go beyond the narrowly instrumentalist goals of the conceptual change model (Garrison & Bentley, 1989, 1990). Fourez (1997) notes, "No particular knowledge is absolutely necessary, in itself, to enable one to live in our society." (p. 920) Cobern and Loving (1998) recognize this *principle of epistemological pluralism* in acknowledging that, "truth is never the sole proprietorship of any single domain of knowledge—not even science" (p. 14).

In schools today violent behavior has emerged as a widely reported problem, but *conceptual violence* has long contaminated the school environment. Our colleagues Marie Larochelle and Jacques Désautels (1996, personal communication) remind us that the conceptual change model puts teachers in the position of colonizing children's minds with scientists' concepts, thus violating the philosophical principle of *epistemological symmetry*. Conceptual violence occurs, for instance, by failing to consider the knowledge developed by students in the context of their local culture as viable and genuine (Désautels, Fleury, & Garrison, 2001). Understanding what, how, and even where a student knows is important, and in a very practical way relates to student ownership of the content and motivation to learn: "The most effective strategies have to do with treating students as capable persons, capitalizing on their knowledge and interests and involving them in determining goals and methods of learning" (Levin, 1994, p.760).

Our opening caveat disavowing recipes for constructivist education does not mean we don't recognize curricular and pedagogical practices that are compatible with constructivism. A variety of strategies can be employed to assist students in their knowledge-building, testing, and understanding. Scaffolding, modeling, coaching, questioning, guiding and advising are but a few strategies. Inquiry teaching (National Research Council, 1996) and problem-based learning (PBL) have been widely promoted in science, social studies and mathematics education. These inductive and cooperative group practices tend to be student-centered and to foster meaning-making. PBL emphasizes using authentic problems across the curriculum at all levels (Bridges & Hallinger, 1995).

There is also an approach to curriculum that is compatible with critical constructivism. In science and sometimes in social studies a Science-Technology-Society (STS) approach typically focuses on issues and addresses the development of students' social consciousness

(Thirunarayanan, 1992). The National Science Teachers Association (1990-1991) identifies features of an STS approach. Further, inquiry and problem-based learning are often ingredients of STS-oriented curricula. Lederman (2004) argues that, "The subject matter of a reformed science education would include the interaction of science and the society in which it is practiced…", and also that, "We should break the cycle of teaching just the facts by including science-and-technology studies in teacher education" (p. B-16).

However, the use of STS curricula and PBL and inquiry methodologies, per se, provide no assurance that one's teaching has a socially critical edge. Carter (1991) has urged a closer attention to Paulo Freire's (1989) *problem posing* methodology. Carter's hope is that students might come to see the world less as a given and more as "reality in the process of transformation" (Freire, 1989, p. 71, cited from Carter, p. 278). Carter's appeal resonates with critical constructivists who want to work with students to mutually attain "emergence of consciousness and critical intervention in reality" (Takacs, 2003, p.3).

Many years after Carter's (1991) admonition, educators wishing to use PBL within an integrated curriculum face even more structural barriers. In describing the results of a National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) curriculum development project, Martina, Hursh, Markowitz, Hart, and Debes (2003) found that the pressure on teachers to adhere to state curriculum standards and for their students to attain high standardized test scores nearly eliminated opportunities for them to incorporate problem-based learning in their classroom curricula. Yet, Martina, et al. (2003) found that teachers who were successful at incorporating environmental health activities involved their students in ethical discussions and incorporated their indigenous knowledges. As an example, one teacher reported:

> The assignments required that students connect what they were learning with their own and others' lives, and consider the consequences of different actions and what might be done to solve problems. Students were pushed to think about questions not normally considered in the standardized curriculum. One teacher offered that "When the students are involved in this type of project they can go further and they can talk about.... how does this affect my life and my family or my friends, or society as a whole? I think it is getting into ethical decision-making, that's very high level. I think it's important that student get to do that." (Martina, et al., p. 25)

Martina et al. (2003) conclude by condemning the oppressive nature of the testing and standards movement and its obstruction of problem-based teaching and learning. The quandary in which Martina and colleagues

find themselves raises important questions and calls for a more critical understanding of constructivism. Nor are theirs the only researcher voices raising such concerns about the unintended consequences of high-stakes tests. Linda Darling-Hammond (2004) cites a number of studies that "have found that high-stakes tests can narrow the curriculum, pushing instruction toward lower order cognitive skills" (p. 1048).

Critical Constructivism: Starting with Teacher Education

We believe that the most important work of teacher education is examining and attempting to transform teachers' *rapport au savoir*. Typically, teachers themselves have undergone an education that has involved repeated instances of reification and normalization of the contingent categories making up knowledge. Immersed in the technocratic rationality of schooling with its reified constructs about organization, learning and curriculum content most teachers have internalized an inert, non-problematic image of formal knowledge through taxonomies, discrete codifications, and implicit and explicit hierarchical organizational forms. However, it does not have to be this way and teacher educators are afforded a unique opportunity to influence the *rapport au savoir* of teachers and, consequently, students.

Recognizing the inseparability of considerations of curriculum content and teaching methods, it is clear to us that the way to change the status quo is not by convincing preservice teachers to adopt *different* organizational forms of knowledge, but rather by ensuring that they *experience something different* in their use of these forms. Here we turn to further develop the idea of *rapport au savoir*. Following are some examples of methods and strategies selected from our own various courses that represent practical means for producing changes in how teachers understand and relate to knowledge and meaning-making.

One of the most subtle but influential changes in pre-service teachers' understanding of knowledge has to do with how they come to view the development of ideas about teaching, learning, curriculum and education. In teacher education programs, educational psychology has often shouldered most of this responsibility, typically providing a survey of learning theorists. All too often, however, preservice teachers view the series of theories being considered as equal competing models from which they can choose (or justify) their own classroom behaviors. Rarely does this survey approach help students understand learning theories as *artifacts* in our evolving conceptualizations about teaching and learning. Rarely does this approach help students understand how to use such theories as referents to their own theorizing about practice.

We recommend placing psychological theories into their cultural context. Recognizing psychological theories as themselves historical artifacts introduces students to the contingent and falsifiable nature of psychological knowledge. For that matter, explicating how any educational theory relates to other contemporary and historical, cultural, economic and political influences reveals the value-ladenness of knowledge itself. For instance, Frank Smith (1998) argues at length that modern learning theory originates in Prussian militarism. Examining the various sociocultural influences on learning theories over time provides the scaffolding to recognize that how people in a society "know," i.e., the kind of knowledge they construct (its nature, evidence, etc.), relates to how they live. For example, teaching and learning that presumes knowledge is indubitable and absolute, even when contradicted, is not amenable to the formation of democratic processes as part of schooling. This is one of the dangers of the structural emphasis on imposed tests and standards. Another danger is that this emphasis suppresses the role of student-generated questions, including reflective and imaginative questions.

In our own courses, we attempt to habituate the formation of questions among preservice teachers in responding to their assigned readings using a technique called Questioning the Author (QtA) (Beck, McKeown, Hamilton, & Kucan, 1997), an "approach that emphasizes the students' construction of meaning from text by encouraging students to collaboratively grapple with and reflect on what an author is trying to say" (McKeown & Beck, 2004, p. 392). Preservice teachers are asked to identify several ideas they have found important in the text. They are asked to state each idea in a sentence or two and to respond to the author with two questions related to each idea. To varying degrees, an activity such as this enables students to interact with an author's ideas before class discussions. Students may share their questions in small groups during class to clarify meaning, generate issues, or evaluate the substantiality of the questions. We have found that students initially resist writing questions and insist on providing short summaries and reactions. However, learning is promoted by the demands of the small group discourse and by other students' modeling of questions. Subsequent activities involve students in critiquing the different levels of questions they compose, making them even more aware of the potential functions of different types of questions. As a teaching strategy, QtA engages students in dialog about text, challenges the notion of author as authoritative voice, moves from teacher-dominated talk toward shared learning, and moves the focus of thinking to the students.

To those teachers who already use the strategies discussed above (and below) with little or no explicit theory, we say three things. First,

bravo, good practice does not require an explicit theory. But we believe that every practitioner has a subjectively reasonable theory working to guide his or her practice, whether recognized or not. Secondly, making one's tacit theory explicit makes it possible to reflect on it. Anyone who already employs these kinds of strategies should be able to further refine his or her practice through reflecting on our suggestions (critically of course).

"Selective Neglect" and Teacher as Curriculum Maker

One effective way for preservice teachers to learn about the value-ladenness of knowledge involves the teacher as curriculum maker and what we call "selective neglect." This exercise requires students to choose what other students in the class will come to know about a given topic, for example, theories in educational psychology. Given a one-week notice, students are asked to research and prepare a no more than five-minute class presentation on a selected theorist. They are limited to identifying and explaining just a few ideas for which the theorist is associated. Although held to a time limit, the students have unlimited time to respond to class questions and debrief with the class afterwards. They can be persuaded of the possibility that what they decide to present about their assigned theorist may be the only information their peers may ever learn about this person. This recognition emphasizes the ethical aspect of the assignment while subtly reminding the students of the power of a teacher's representations to distort student understanding.

Academic and social discussions become dilapidated whenever agents find themselves in a simple either/or, pro/con debate. In part, this is because many do not perceive issue analysis as a part of the "normal" construction of thought. But because of the pluralistic nature of knowledge, rarely are issues ever accurately portrayed in neat categories of right and wrong. Teachers may provide their students a format for analyzing "issues" that goes beyond the traditional pro-con debate. An issue may be defined as a problem whose definition or solution involves multiple and competing perspectives either over ends (values, ideals, etc.), means (methods, techniques, tools, etc.) or both. One assignment we recommend requires students to provide at least three perspectives about an issue, a technique that promotes understanding the complexity often involved in issues. Students should come to understand that social issues often arise from differences over ends, means or both, and that how a problem is defined often constricts the possible solutions, which sometimes is indicative of a power move.

Issue analysis is one strategy that addresses the fact that truth

can be elusive in a world full of social claims purportedly supported by various kinds of often-contradictory evidence. Seldom will we have the time or perseverance to examine the basis for every claim we hear in our daily lives, yet in the professional field of education, developing a process of teaching with a more critical understanding of constructivism requires preservice teachers to understand and evaluate the philosophical nature of subject matter claims and the professional claims of other educators. Distinguishing between claims based on empirical studies vs. those based primarily on someone's ideological point of view may involve a change in one's consideration of what "truth" is. As students become more aware of the limitations of particular studies, design flaws, and other research "problems," they develop both a more critical attitude and a more positive attitude about their ability to fairly and successfully challenge other people's knowledge claims.

Another teaching activity that we have found effective is something we call "research thinking." As one of the first classes, graduate education students immediately begin collecting qualitative and quantitative data at locations ranging from shopping malls to their own practicum school sites. The first week begins with a general observation assignment with no guidelines based on the variety of data provided, and each subsequent week the assignment becomes more focused. In this strategy students experience situations first, process various ideas, and then later, as a topic comes up in class conversations, the instructor is able to identify the conventional research label. Concurrently, students are asked to bring in newspaper articles that purport to be based upon some scientific finding. Spending the first half-hour of class discussing the claims in these articles promotes a more sophisticated understanding of research.

Here is an activity one of us uses that is easily transferred to other curricular domains. In the Cube Investigation (Working Group on Teaching Evolution, 1998), students are invited to consider how investigating a cardboard cube is analogous to the process of science. Each student is presented with a cardboard cube containing markings in the middle of each face and on two corners. The rule is that students may not look at the facedown side. Markings on the five visible faces provide clues as to what might be on the hidden face. After some thought, the students predict what is on the bottom face. They are then told they may slightly lift only one corner of the cube and use a mirror to view one of the hidden corners. The cube is then removed and put away, leaving them wondering about what is on the rest of the hidden surface. The debriefing features a discussion of how the cube investigation represents or does not represent the nature of science.

It is possible to extend the foregoing activity in ways that profoundly

obviate the contingent, contextualized, and constructed nature of knowledge. During the subsequent class the students take a "pre-test" designed to disclose some of their assumptions about science. Students also view a series of optical illusions illustrating that our brains are organs that interpret sense impressions, as opposed to representing external reality. The objective is to make explicit one of the central tenets of constructivism, that "meaning is assigned" instead of being inherent in external phenomena. From there the class reads selections in a course text on the philosophy of science. In this text Alan Chalmers (1999) discusses optical illusions and then goes into the problem of induction as a basis for science. The class is then presented researchers' findings on adolescent students' beliefs about the nature of science (Ryan & Aikenhead, 1992).

Many in the class typically hold similar beliefs about science as those that were enumerated in the researchers' findings. Recognizing this, these students, most of whom are practicing teachers, find themselves in a state of cognitive disequilibrium; they begin to question their prior understandings. In following class sessions, they consider various ideas about the nature of science, but meanwhile they work in teams to conduct interviews of scientists and students on how they view science. Not surprisingly, they find that scientists can have naïve views about their own craft, and some have found that their own understandings have become more sophisticated than those of the scientists they interviewed. Thus this is an assignment that can be empowering to students and even discernable in their subsequent attitudes and behavior. One teacher in the class who interviewed a polymer chemist and two high school students reported these results:

> ...the scientist and the students both believe there is a scientific method that scientists use when they conduct investigations and experiments. The scientist believes that when carrying out an investigation, most of the steps of the scientific method are used . . . . Science educators (however) should emphasize to their students that no research method is applied universally by all scientists. Both the students and the scientist also possess misconceptions about what constitutes a theory and what constitutes a law. After reviewing some current science textbooks, I feel as though these concepts are not clearly distinguished. (Melinda Sellars, personal communication, 11/15/03)

Reflections on One's Own Biography

The following strategy for fostering critical-constructivist thinking was designed as the first class assignment for a teacher education course in science methods, but it is adaptable to social studies and social foundations of education as well.[2] Each student is asked to write a

critical autobiography (Moscovici, Nichols, Habib, Tippins, & Sullivan, 1994) focusing on the socio-cultural aspects of their own experience as science learners, both in and outside of school. Reflecting on their own upbringing can help students become aware of their own epistemological positionality, as well as become aware that learning (which most students typically understand as a strictly personal and psychological affair) is really a *social* experience. Interestingly, a surprising number of white, middle-class students naively will report that socio-cultural factors have had no influence on their science learning!

Another methods course assignment with similar consciousness-raising potential is the reflective journal (Koch, 1999). Students preparing to become teachers can reflect upon the role of language in our profession, especially regarding how the language of teaching is imbued with metaphors that separate content from method, feelings from thoughts, objectivity from subjectivity, teaching from learning and, ultimately, teachers from students. Meier (1992) suggests that conditions need to be created for teachers to change how they view teaching and learning, to develop new practices consistent with these understandings, and to develop collegial work habits to replace the overly private and individualistic work culture that presently defines teaching. In believing that "teachers must lead the way to their own liberation" (p. 599), she places the onus for making these structural changes on the teachers themselves. To us, this means that teachers must be willing and able to both deconstruct and reconstruct the contingent constructions that have been continually reified throughout their lives.

Finally, we offer an example of curriculum framed by constructivist thinking; in this case it is of a small progressive high school located in a metropolitan area of about 300,000 in Virginia. Community High School (CHS) is situated in the city center in the midst of local cultural and political action. The curriculum was planned over a two-year period and organized for 60 grades 9-12 students as a "museum school" (King, 1998; Bentley, 2007). As of this writing CHS is in its fifth year of operation. Students are involved in projects and investigations involving the cultural institutions and social service agencies of the local community. The school director and its teachers were selected based on their socio-cultural awareness and for their interest in fostering a critical consciousness in the student body. The deconstruction and reconstruction of premises is a strong component of all courses. A ninth grade science course, for example, was designed with a history and philosophy of science emphasis. The results so far have been encouraging, with high student retention. To learn more, visit the school Web site at http://www.communityhigh.net

Conclusion

Though constructivism remains the "in" theory in education, what prevails among educators today is the most trivial of the many interpretations of constructivism—simply that meanings are constructed. The critical constructivism we advocate places its emphasis on reflection, imagination, social consciousness, and democratic citizenship. We believe this interpretation should be a central theoretical referent for all educational practitioners. In preservice teacher education, critical constructivism should lie at the center of discussions about the nature of learning, teaching, curriculum and schooling—as a sociopolitical process.

Without this kind of referent, teachers-to-be rarely become perplexed by epistemological considerations or become aware of their political consequences. We advocate a critical constructivist pedagogy that enables students to continually shape and reshape their own conceptual biographies through the development of intellectual tools and attitudes about the social basis of knowledge, a pedagogy that enables students to better understand society's official knowledge as it relates to their own indigenous knowledges, thus developing for themselves a new *rapport au savoir*.

References

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., Hamilton, R. L., & Kucan, L. (1997). *Questioning the author: An approach for enhancing student engagement with text*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Bentley, M. (2007). Community-connected education: Southwest Virginia's new museum high school. In B. Lord & G. Lord (Eds.), *The Manual of museum learning* (pp. 83-94). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Bentley, M., Ebert, E., & Ebert, C. (2007). *Teaching constructivist science, K–8: Nurturing natural investigators in the standards-based classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bettencourt, A. (1993). The construction of knowledge: A radical constructivist view. In K. Tobin (Ed.), *Constructivism: The practice of constructivism in science education* (pp. 39-50). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Bridges, E. M. & Hallenger, P. (1995). *Implementing problem-based learning in leadership development*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

Carter, C. (1991). Science-technology-society and access to scientific knowledge. *Theory into Practice, 30*(4), 273-279.

Chalmers, A. F. (1999). *What is this thing called science?* (3rd ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing.

Charlot, B., Bautier, E., & Rochex, J.-Y. (1992). *École et savoir dans les banlieues... et ailleurs*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Cobern, W.W. & Loving, C.C. (1998). Defining "Science" in a multicultural world: Implications for science education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching. Retrieved June 5, 1998 from http://www.wmich.edu/slcsp/148.html

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Standards, accountability, and school reform. *Teachers College Record, 106*(6), 1047-1085.

Engle, S. & Ochoa, A. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in social studies*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fourez, G. (1997). Scientific and technological literacy as a social practice. *Social Studies of Science, 27*, 903-936.

Freire, P. (1989). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (Trans. by M. Ramos). New York: Seabury Press. (Original work published 1970).

Garrison, J., & Bentley, M. L. (1989). Pre-conceptual and non-rational aspects of cognitive change in science learning. Presentation at First International Conference on the History and Philosophy of Science in Science Teaching. Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

Garrison, J.W. & Bentley, M.L. (1990). Science education, conceptual change and breaking with everyday experience. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 10*(1), 19-35.

King, K. (1998). Alternative educational systems: A multi-case study in museum schools. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University. Dissertation Abstracts International. Retrieved June 20, 2002 from http://home.iag.net/~ksking/muslearn.html

Koch, J. (1999). *Science stories: Teachers and children as science learners*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Lederman, M. (2004). Science is a social enterprise. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 50*(36), B 16.

Levin, B. (1994, June). Improving Educational productivity: Putting students as the center. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 758-760.

McKeown, M.G., & Beck, I.L. (2004). Transforming knowledge into professional development resources: Six teachers implement a model of teaching for understanding text. *The Elementary School Journal, 104*(5), 391-408.

Meier, D. (1992). Reinventing teaching. *Teachers College Record, 4*, 594-609.

Moscovici, H., Nichols, S., Habib, G., Tippins, D.J., & Sullivan, B. (1994, January). Reflective 'tools' for college teaching and learning. Panel presentation, Association for the Education of Teachers in Science, El Paso, TX

National Research Council. (1996). *National science education standards*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Science Teachers Association. (1990-1991). Science/technology/society: A new effort for providing appropriate science for all (position statement). In *NSTA Handbook* (pp. 47-48). Washington, DC: Author

Osborne, R., & Freyberg, P. (1985). *Learning in science*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Posner, G. J., Strike, K. A., Hewson, P. W., & Gertzog, W. A. (1982). Accommodation of a scientific conception: Towards a theory of conceptual change. *Science Education, 66*(2), 211-227.

Takacs, D. (2003, Summer). How does your positionality bias your epistemology?

Thought & Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal, 27-38.

Thirunarayanan, M. O. (Ed.). (1992). *Think and act -make an impact: Handbook of science, technology and society*, Volumes I & II. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.

Windschitl, M. (1999). The challenges of sustaining a constructivist classroom culture. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *80*(10), 751-755.

Working Group on Teaching Evolution. (1998). *Teaching about evolution and the nature of science.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Retrieved January 17, 2000 from http://books.nap.edu/html/evolution98

A Reflective Discourse on Science Learning and the Merits of Simulation

Janet Kelly
Texas Christian University
Curtis Bradley
The Petroleum Institute
Jonathan Gratch
Texas Christian University
& Robert Maninger
Texas Christian University

Introduction

It is widely understood that science and technology education are central to the development and prosperity of all modern societies. Embedded in the context of recent U.S. science education reform initiatives from the national to local levels is the belief in and commitment to adequate science instruction for all students. Also, it is clear that learning science necessitates a move from passivity to activity and that students develop a better understanding of science through inquiry and exploration. The common thread envisioned by these reform efforts is an improved and uniform level of scientific literacy, which, according to the *National Science Education Standards*, is generally defined to mean "that a person can ask, [and then] find or determine answers to, questions derived from curiosity about everyday experiences" (1996, p. 22). Further, the authors of *Science for All Americans* (Rutherford & Ahlgren, 1990, p. v) state that science education should equip our students "to participate thoughtfully with fellow citizens in building and protecting a society that is open, decent, and vital. America's future—its ability to create a truly just society, to sustain its economic vitality, and to remain secure in a world torn by hostilities—depends more than ever on the character and

quality of the education that the nation provides for all of its children." Of course, a scientifically literate citizenry electorate is essential and fundamental to this globally-shared vision.

While it appears there is general consensus among educators that a primary mission of K-12 science education is scientific literacy, debate wages over how to best achieve this elusive goal. Certainly, there is no magic bullet, no one-size-fits-all strategy that can accomplish this task. Yet, there is a great deal to be gained from a continuous and vigorous discussion on learning and knowledge acquisition: schools and educators must evolve to teach more effectively, and, in turn, assist in moving their students toward a more definitive and measurable outcome known as scientific literacy.

Learning Science

Learning science should be a natural or automatic result of a coherent and relevant curriculum, since it concerns our most basic and common physical daily life experiences. Yet, it is clear that the majority of textbooks and associated activities do not reflect the cohesiveness and interdisciplinary dynamics of the field. The world is rich in natural and technological phenomena that await exploration, description, and demystification. However, student interest and appreciation for the universality and practicality of the subject is virtually non-existent. This is attributed, in part, to an enculturation process that socializes students (and their teachers) to believe, conclude, or assume that science is an inherently difficult and remote subject to learn, understand, and value. The question must be asked, how can educators capture the excitement of learning and investigating science for themselves and their students? What must take place so that teachers and students will commonly and enthusiastically echo Nobel-Prize winning physicist Richard Feynman's sentiments: "The world looks so different after learning science" (1968, p. 319).

We know that learning both occurs deliberately and not as deliberately as an individual interacts with and experiments upon the corresponding environment. However, students are not taught or adequately encouraged to contextualize science explorations (in a classroom or independently) and place this knowledge in a framework in which they can attach their own reality and prior experience. Frequently, they grow discouraged or frustrated in their efforts to make real sense of science. Over time, their alienation and dislike of the subject grows. As an example, one can readily see the learning estrangement when teachers prematurely lecture on complex science topics or over-emphasize abstractions, theories, and vocabulary. Learner frustration is a natural manifestation produced by

teaching practices that render the subject foreign to the learners' present reality. In these scenarios, the teacher is trying to "pour" knowledge into the mind of the student or into the "tabula rasa" (blank slate) as the 17th century philosopher, John Locke, would say. In this "passive mode" of learning, students take on a role in which they are "told" what they, as learners, "need to know" by their teachers. As early as 1902, the educator John Dewey recognized that this type of instruction was ineffective and asserted that the student was not a "docile recipient of facts" (p. 3). The explorative and creative aspects (through inquiry and problem solving) of the subject are lost on the student-as-spectator model of learning.

Constructivist educators would agree with Dewey that "knowledge cannot be transferred to a passive receiver. It has to be actively built up by every single knower" (von Glaserfeld, 1992, p. 171). Therefore, knowledge cannot exist without individual construction; knowledge is constructed, not acquired (Byrnes, 1996). Piaget (1980), regarded as the founder of constructivism, states:

> Knowledge does not result from a mere recording of observations without a structuring activity on the part of the subject. Nor do any a priori or innate cognitive structures exist in man; the functioning of intelligence alone is hereditary and creates structures only through an organization of successive actions performed on objects. Consequently, an epistemology conforming to the data of psychogenesis could be neither empiricist nor pre-formationist, but could consist only of a constructivism. (p. 23)

Constructivism allows that the learner utilizes prior knowledge to make sense of new explorations, and thus "construct" meaning by synthesizing experiences, both past and present. Indeed, student learning outcomes are quite sensitive to the breadth and quality of each student's prior experiences. Individuals with rich and varied concrete experiences of natural phenomena, tools, and the inner workings of machines, for example, are more readily guided in their own attempt to understand and relate to abstractions like force, energy, and momentum. In this way, constructivism helps inform our enthusiasm for the learning potential and fits seamlessly with classroom science explorations. For the ever-increasing fraction of students who are experientially ill prepared for understanding the abstract concepts, connections, and themes of science instruction (Kelly, 2000), exploration offers some much-needed concrete references. Likewise, students' prior experience impacts the benefit they get from reading and listening to explanations of science topics, but the basic constructivist tenets do not align as well with the written word. Lowery (1998) submits that written formats (e.g., textbooks) offer minimal assistance to learner understanding because symbols/words do not

represent reality, and words cannot be manipulated by investigation. For a student to understand or even interpret what a symbol means depends on previous experiential knowledge. Printed words become powerful only when the text relates, enriches, and supports prior understanding and experience. When this "transfiguration" of knowledge occurs, the written word becomes a reorganization of "old" knowledge with "new" connections established (Lowery, 1998). It is significant to reiterate again and again that knowledge, communicated from writer-to-reader, speaker-to-listener, or teacher-to-student does not, in and of itself, connote a successful transmission of meaning to the learner. Meaning is created through personal experience and viable connections (Kelly, 2000; Redish, 2003; von Glaserfeld, 1992) made by the individual's "subjective knowledge of the world" (Saunders, 1992, p. 136).

How then can teachers best utilize this information on learning to the most benefit of their students? First, the teacher must recognize that they must help students make "good" connections between what the student already knows, or thinks he knows, with new knowledge. "Old" knowledge may be faulty and require reconstruction (Anderson & Smith, 1987). Consequently, an effective teacher must create a learning environment that encourages this conceptual change in learning possible for the student. A teacher that "allows students to retain their naïve conceptions is doomed to produce only misunderstanding or rote memorization" (Anderson & Smith, 1987, p. 91). To assist the student and further his/her understanding, a teacher must know that it is not the amount or quality of information that hinders student performance; it is the organization of that information which is lacking. Teachers, themselves, must learn how to organize their own knowledge and experiences before they can then instruct students on how to do the same. Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000) write:

> Experts' abilities to reason and solve problems depend on well-organized knowledge that affects what they notice and how they represent problems. Experts are not simply 'general problem solvers' who have learned a set of strategies that operate across all domains, whether chess, electronics, mathematics, or classroom teaching...An emphasis on the patterns perceived by experts suggests that pattern recognition is an important strategy for helping students develop confidence and competence. These patterns provide triggering conditions for accessing knowledge that is relevant to a task. (p. 36)

So, effective teachers must model sense-making and pattern-seeking behaviors and expertly guide students to realize, directly confront, and rethink their own misconceptions. In this way, effective teaching of science should incorporate thoughtful, reflective experiences that promote

student hypothesizing and questioning to foster genuine interest and curiosity in, and a deeper understanding of, the subject. The investigative processes should be replicable, so that students organize the information they receive, recognize the patterns and relationships in doing the science, and, finally, make associations with prior understanding, regardless of the content. Over time, this type of training should become routine. Teaching practices that facilitate such involvement should help to make learning science more natural, less frustrating, and less alienating. Science should then take its place as a central part of a relevant and meaningful curriculum and not be regarded as a peripheral and difficult yet 'important' subject.

We are faced with significant challenges if we are to make progress toward improved scientific literacy. Despite the universality of natural and technological phenomena in our lives, an increasing fraction of our students have limited exposure to the kinds of hands-on, concrete experiences, coupled with timely, truthful, and simple explanations, which combine to prepare students for further science instruction. To counter this, we need well-trained, confident teachers, strategic curricula, and appropriate learning materials that together can invigorate science education and reverse declining achievement in and increased student alienation from science.

Science the Subject

Teaching science is distinguished from other subjects because it is a "unique" combination of content lecture and laboratory explorations. No other content courses are delivered in such a format. Given this fact, why are laboratory experiences important for science instruction? The *Board on Science Education* of the *National Research Council* (2005) wrote:

> In our review of the literature we have identified a number of science learning goals that have been attributed to laboratory experiences, including:
>
> - enhancing mastery of subject matter;
> - developing scientific reasoning;
> - understanding the complexity and ambiguity of empirical work;
> - developing practical skills;
> - understanding the nature of science;
> - cultivating interest in science and interest in learning science; and
> - developing teamwork abilities. (p. 3)

Also, that "some of the science learning goals presented above, particularly understanding the complexity and ambiguity of empirical work, can be attained only through laboratory experiences" (NRC 2005, p. 4).

Yet, too often, the laboratory component is much less than we hope for. The *Board* argues that while "the state of the research knowledge base on laboratory experiences is dismal... even so, [it] suggests that the laboratory experiences of most high school students are equally dismal" (NRC 2005, p. 11).

Among other recommendations based on recent research, the *Board* recommends "integrated instructional units [that] connect laboratory experiences with other types of science learning activities," where students "are engaged in framing research questions, making observations, designing and executing experiments, gathering and analyzing data, and constructing scientific arguments and explanations" (NRC 2005, p. 4). Yet, it is typical that lecture (aka direct teaching method) alone is the traditional delivery method utilized by teachers to impart knowledge (the theoretical and factual content) to the students, and laboratory exercise is viewed only as an activity that reinforces the content delivery. Based on this tendency toward lower expectations and encouraged passivity, it may certainly be reasonable to surmise that lecture would have no place in the constructivist model. However, a teacher lecture followed by directed activity and class discussion lends itself well to scaffolding, questioning, and hypothesizing, which in turn, allows for a better understanding of the topic (Kelly, 2000). Further, while laboratory experiences, typically including "hands on" practical applications or demonstrations of course content, have been the supposed experimental, constructivist portion of the learning activity, they do not typically fare well under closer scrutiny. In many instances these "hands-on" experiences are nothing more than a mechanical regurgitation of an earlier lecture, and subsequently do not contribute much to the individual learner's conceptual understanding (Handelsman et al., 2004; Redish, 2003).

The inquiry model, which by outward appearance aligns with the constructivist perspective, offers a viable alternative to the traditional direct teaching model (lecture-lab), if utilized appropriately. With the inquiry approach, students act independently in their research (e.g., lab exercise, project, etc.) to offer pragmatic solutions to a posed problem. The National Research Council (1996) presents inquiry as "activities ...in which they (students) develop knowledge and understanding of scientific ideas, as well as an understanding of how scientists study the natural world" (p. 23). Further, the inquiry advocacy aligns with the basic premise of scientific literacy and that is students "ask, find, or determine answers to questions derived from curiosity about everyday experiences" (National Research Council, 1996, p. 22). With the inquiry model, the teacher's role transforms into that of a facilitator, that is, someone who guides activity, but

does not engage in controlling student investigation or thought as is the case with the direct teaching model.

Though much has been done to emphasize the basic tenets of inquiry and the "doing" of science in the classroom, the fact is, much of science teaching, in the name of inquiry, has been reduced to hands-on activity that frequently becomes monotonous and mundane. Redish (2003) asserts that students "can actively work with equipment and still not learn very much" (p. 182). The purpose of doing science is to enable learners to make connections, observe patterns and relationships, and reflect upon the exploration, but in many instances, and for whatever reason, this is not being done in the school environment. Somehow, even the scientific method has become mechanized and rote in the science classroom.

By its very name, inquiry suggests probing and investigation beyond the scope of the traditional science classroom. True science inquiry possesses a certain amount of serendipity that all too often practically vanishes in a classroom. Granted, the topic totality of science is far-reaching and nebulous and cannot always be confined or categorized in a classroom exercise. Yet, much of science instruction, even inquiry-based, has become exactly what it was never intended to be—an overly structured classroom event. If the approach is to survive satisfactorily and intact, then educators should be alerted to the need for a variety in instructional routine, including the utilization of technology to explore a world of science and problem solving that might not otherwise be available to the student learner.

Technology and Teaching Science

Today's fast-paced world is saturated by almost daily advancements in technology. Computers and technological tools have become commonplace among scientists, researchers, and the scientific community. Meanwhile, science educators struggle to stay abreast of change. In some instances, teachers are unprepared to utilize technology in their classrooms because they have little or no training and are fearful of what they do not know. Hurd (2000) acknowledges that the challenge in science education is now connecting technology, as a knowledge-producing system, with those who are a part of the knowledge-using system.

As with anything progressive, technology is viewed with both reverence and skepticism. Robertson (2003) observes that technology is enticing because it represents an answer (rightly or wrongly) to educational ills. She states:

> Information technology promises to deliver more (and more important) learning for every student accomplished in less time; to ensure "indi-

> vidualization" no matter how large and diverse the class; to obliterate the differences and disadvantages associated with race, gender, and class; to vary and yet standardize the curriculum; to remove subjectivity from student evaluation; to make reporting and record keeping a snap; to draw out reluctant and disinterested parents; to keep discipline problems to a minimum; to enhance professional learning and discourse; and to transform the discredited teacher-centered classroom into that paean of pedagogy; the constructivist, student-centered classroom. (p. 284-285)

Proponents of technology use in the science classroom would debate that technology has few shortcomings in spite of the criticisms levied. Keller and Keller (2005) maintain that teachers have failed to offer students classroom experiences that incorporate scientific inquiry and appropriate methodology. They list a multitude of mistakes that teachers commit in the name of science which impact student learning negatively, such as: "inadequate exposure to science research, fear that experiments will fail unless carefully scripted, belief in efficacy of their current techniques, unfamiliarity with technology, and a need by teachers to know all of the answers" (pp. 4-5). In either case, Rieber (2005) argues that current evidence suggests that technology has had little impact on education despite the money spent on it, and that the biggest impact of technology can be seen outside of traditional schooling, particularly in electronic gaming. Further, he notes that most of the research on multimedia in education has focused on "scripted" or explanatory media and less on media that provides experiential learning. He observes that "of course, explanation and experience are important in education, but advocates of games, simulations, and microworlds put experience first with explanations serving a supporting role" (p. 550). Microworlds are a form of exploratory learning simulation considered to have "important" embedded ideas while games are simulations that are designed and found to be intrinsically motivating and enjoyable (p. 558).

Even as we note a history of overly optimistic predictions of technological transformation in education, we contend that computer program simulations have emerged as "cutting edge" tools that promote science learning in different contexts and introduce students to new and unique experiences that cannot be replicated effectively through classroom investigations or other activities. Simulations are considered an important step in presenting real world science experiences that otherwise could not be performed in a classroom. Further, some educators espouse that simulations extend the range of student investigations by making the "abstract" experience more concrete and by providing immediate feedback about the exploration, which is often better than what teachers explain through lecture and reinforcement activity (Ronen & Eliahu, 2000; Trumper, 2003).

Simulation: What Is It and How Does It Work?

What exactly is a computer simulation? It is a mathematical model which produces an artificial representation or re-creation of real world (and/or imagined) phenomena, as encoded in a computer program. Simulations can be divided into two types: operational and conceptual. The operational simulation is used for experiential learning and is often procedural in design. Conceptual simulations, discussed in this paper, are grounded in investigative activity; that is, students perform experiments, set/change variables, collect data, make inferences, and draw conclusions based upon their experiences. It is this conceptual simulation model which is rooted in the tenets of constructivism (de Jong & van Joolingen, 1998). A constructivist would offer that the simulation provides a platform for the learner to construct/modify new understandings as he/she connects with prior knowledge in an effort to make sense of the new "information."

All simulations share a common goal and that is, to be successful, they must "incorporate effective features so that the users' attention is focused on the essential learning that they are undertaking" (Yeo et al., 2004, p. 1357). The success of students who use simulations is directly related to the details of the program and the way in which it is used and presented (Steinberg, 2000). Yeo et al. (2004) believes that the obligation of the simulation is to "provide students with enabling experiences in authentic applications rather than situations without a context, and on cultivating learning processes rather than assimilating isolated knowledge items" (p. 1352).

Early computer simulations involved limited control over variables and parameters. These simulations promoted a more "step by step cookbook" approach for students to follow in order to reach a specific objective (Windschitl & Andre, 1998). However, more recent computer based simulations allow for a greater input control over variables and parameters. The number of variables present and the relations between the variables is the simulation's degree of elaboration (White & Frederiksen, 1990). The greater the degree of elaboration created, the greater the level of complexity of the simulation. The manipulation of the variables to produce a new effect allows the learner to predict and test a wide variety of situations within the confines of the simulation. Throughout the testing of a concept within the simulation the learner maintains an active role of changing the variables in order to predict how the alteration will affect the outcome (Windschitl & Andre, 1998). The added control over variables and parameters being tested allows the student user to manipulate the virtual environment and conceptual

theories through means that are either not available within the real world or are otherwise inaccessible to the student. Windschitl and Andre write "the ability of simulations to portray phenomena and allow users to interact with the dynamics of a model system . . . creates [a] unique way of helping learners conceptualize" (1998, p. 148).

As simulations become more sophisticated, they are used in an increasing number of ways to support and/or study science learning and to tackle the variety of science learning goals discussed previously. For example, the combination of significant student user freedom and experimental simplification has led to the use of simulated microworlds to provide students and their teachers new opportunities for exploratory "scientific discovery" learning. These simulations allow students, with significant guidance, to generate their own hypotheses, develop and then interpret the results of experiments or tests, and regulate their own learning (de Jong & van Joolingen, 1998). Goldberg's (2001) computer-supported learning environments provide good examples. His pedagogical approach was to have students extend their experience by collecting additional phenomenological data from simulations after comparable initial hands-on experiments (e.g. electrostatic charging by induction). Then conceptual models were made explicit with computer simulations so that students could collect "model-based evidence" (e.g. coloring model of electrostatic charge).

Finally, simulations allowed multiple representations of the same or related concepts (e.g. currents in a circuit shown by arrows, values, bulb brightness, and compass needle deflection). In another example, Finkelstein et. al. (2005) have shown that improved (faster) subsequent circuit construction and challenge problem solutions were achieved by university-level students who used a sophisticated circuit simulation rather than to spend time with an equivalent equipment-based lab activity. It is clear that we should expect that stand-alone simulations, simulations in combination with hands-on equipment, and simulations integrated into other learning activities will experience the same developmental trends of ever-increasing interactivity, realistic rendering, and user-savvy design sophistication, as evident in software development led by the computer and video gaming industry.

Kulik (2002, p. 3) states that "simulation programs seem to focus on higher level instructional objectives" rather than regular tutorial (explanatory) programs as the simulations focus on problem solving and so help students as they work to integrate facts and concepts into their previously existing schemata. In such programs (like Goldberg's) students are invoking the simulation in order to develop their own refined conceptual understanding of the material, often by predicting outcomes

based upon their preferred method of problem solving. Should the results of the prediction come back outside the student's accepted conceptual understanding, progress is blocked and so dissatisfaction occurs (Windschitl & Andre, 1998). Further testing within the simulation framework can result in confirmation or denial of the prediction based upon the learner's existing understanding. It then becomes the teacher's responsibility (opportunity) to clarify misunderstandings via the progression of the activity, and/or through discussion and further investigation.

The Merits, Detractions, and Feasibilities of Simulation

Can simulations help students to learn science? Student performance, as a result of simulation interaction, is variable as reported in the research. Some findings are favorable regarding student achievement and the use of simulations (Sethi, 2005; Steinberg, 2000; Stieff & Wilensky, 2003; Zacharia, 2003) while other reports reflect little or no difference in student accomplishment when compared to the traditional classroom (Robertson, 2003). In the early developmental stages of simulations, criticism was directed at the rigidity and unrealistic representation of the operational real-world (Feisel & Rosa, 2005). However, improved computational technologies now allow the creation of simulations that more nearly emulate the real world, or at least, important aspects of real physical experience. Probably pilot training models serve as the best example of a real-world application; even the pilots "can attest to the realism that simulation can provide" (Feisel & Rosa, 2005, p. 125).

In this real-life context, sophisticated simulations have had a dramatic impact on pilot education and testing. So, is it reasonable to expect or hope that science education will be similarly impacted by simulation use? We argue that simulations, if appropriately designed, will help students to bridge the gap between their concrete experiences and the abstract principles often associated with science concepts taught in the classroom. An instructor may patiently and repeatedly explain the desired concrete-to-abstract relationship to students, yet research indicates that the conventional lecture approach is not a successful model to use when trying to prepare learners with the necessary cognitive tools for conceptual understanding (Stieff & Wilensky, 2003). The interactive experience and the program visualizations in a simulation, coupled with appropriate classroom instruction, can provide the student with the necessary concrete information to develop new insights about the concept and so, make progress in aligning science abstractions (Zacharia, 2003). Another benefit to simulation use is the immediate feedback provided during learner interaction with the program (Sethi, 2005).

This immediate feedback is in direct contrast to the several day communication delay associated with the traditional lab report. Perhaps the strongest case for the rapid development and promotion of simulations is those classrooms where laboratory activity is virtually non-existent. In such cases, simulations may provide a solution for science teachers who, lacking sufficient support to have appropriate space, time, or budget would otherwise "do without" or somehow try to "make do." Also, if simulations are integrated with more traditional published teaching materials, their use will be strongly encouraged. For teachers who lack the confidence to discuss and guide science explorations with their students, even with simple or common materials, it seems that carefully crafted simulations with built-in pedagogical support should be very helpful. Further, with this kind of support, it may be possible that such teachers could gain the confidence to branch out from the simulations to related real-world explorations.

So, we see that simulations could provide learning opportunities by penetrating into classrooms that would otherwise have minimal science activities. Still, while simulations can help teachers address a number of science learning goals, simulations are not the real world and exploring a model is not the same as experiencing natural phenomena. Simulations would, for example, be a very artificial way to teach the real-world skill of trouble-shooting or sorting out the ambiguities that comes naturally with real equipment and non-ideal conditions. Simulations are intended to emulate real world phenomena and provide meaningful and engaging experiences for students, but they are not, however, to replace laboratory investigations altogether (Keller & Keller, 2005).

Simulations are utilitarian with numerous possibilities for the science classroom including:

- pre-lab exercises to provide students with an idea of the real lab that they will encounter;
- alternative options to the traditional lecture delivery format including immediate feedback during and culminating the simulation activity;
- a bridge between the concrete and abstract principles of science;
- virtual reality experiences that train students in proper scientific techniques and procedures; and
- substitutes for laboratory experiments.

In spite of all the positive benefits that may be attributed to simulations, one must pose a very basic question: If students perform computer simulations, are they learning to do science or only learning about science? This same question should be posed for student participation in

real-world laboratory and other science learning activities. Although simulations have evolved and advanced from their less than sophisticated beginnings, clear limitations do exist. Most technology advocates would issue assurances that using a simulation is doing science because programs are explicitly interactive, even if there is no "physical" manipulation of real world variables. Learners are can be engaged in making predictions, hypothesizing, testing variables, and collecting and analyzing data. Both experimental lab and simulation advocates would argue that, in each circumstance, the learner is able to challenge existing conceptual understanding through the process of predicting and evaluating possible outcomes created by his/her own devices in the laboratory setting.

Learning often requires a totality experience which even state-of-the-art simulations cannot provide. There are no tactile or kinesthetic facets; students are unable to feel, taste, smell, or touch their materials to obtain an understanding of what it is really like to perform the experiment. Further, simulations are inductive in nature, and while educators strongly support the inquiry process as a strategizing or problem-solving technique, the "big picture" is not always self-evident to learners. Clearly, the teacher must provide intervention so that students gain a better understanding of their simulation experiences.

Conclusions

Computer-based simulations have established their role in the science classroom as an interactive interface for student investigation. As the learner is able to manipulate the parameters of their virtual environment within the simulation students construct new understanding of the underlying concepts through inferring and predicting possible outcomes. Although an artificial construct, the usefulness of computer-based simulation lies within the dynamics of the real world theory/model it endeavors to reproduce. Simple simulations may be viewed as more tutorial; objective oriented "cook-book" style method with no place in a constructivist setting. However, increasingly sophisticated and interactive simulations (e.g., with greater user freedom due to numerous adjustable variables or parameters) increases the likelihood that the constructivist educator would utilize it in the classroom setting.

Should, or can science simulations replace the real laboratory experience? No, but they definitely have a place in the learning process and should be viewed as supplementary tools to classroom instruction and laboratory experiences. Finally, we argue that well-designed simulations can help students "interpret the underlying scientific conceptions of the

program, compare them with other their own conceptions, formulate and test hypotheses, and reconcile any discrepancy between their ideas and the observation in the simulation" (Zacharia, 2003, p. 796). The research clearly supports the use of simulations as a tool to improve science learning, not as a way to supplant the teacher or the laboratory experience.

As technologies become more commonly used in the K-12 environment, it is recommended that educators continue to examine the potential benefits and detrimental effects of simulations on student learning. Furthermore, teachers must become more skilled in their use of technology and should act as change agents in the classroom as they elaborate on the science topic and reinforce main points so that students may build on their own knowledge and move beyond the boundaries presented through the simulation.

References

Anderson, C.W. & Smith, E.L.(1987). Teaching science. In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.). *Educators' handbook: A research perspective* (pp. 84-109). New York: Longman.

Board on Science Education, National Research Council. (2005). *America's lab report: Investigations in high school science*. Washington DC: National Academies Press.

Bransford, J., & Brown, A.L., & Cocking, R.R. (Eds.). (2000*). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Byrnes, J.P. (1996). *Cognitive development and learning in instructional contexts*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

De Jong, T., & van Joolingen, W.R. (1998). Scientific discovery learning with computer simulations of conceptual domains. *Review of Educational Research, 68*, 179-201.

Dewey, J. (1902). *The child and the curriculum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Feisel, L.D., & Rosa, A.J. (2005). The role of the laboratory in undergraduate engineering education. *Journal of Engineering Education, 94*(1), 121-130.

Finkelstein, N.D., Adams, W.K., Keller, C.J. Kohl, P.B., Perkins, K.K., Podolefsky, N.S., Reid, S., & LeMaster, R. (2005). When learning about the real world is better done virtually: A study of substituting computer simulations for laboratory equipment. *Physical Review Special Topics – Physics Education Research, 1*, 010103, 1-8.

Feynman, R.P. (1968). What is science? *The Physics Teacher*, 7(6), 313-320.

Goldberg, F. (2001). Some roles of computer technology in helping students learn physics: computer simulations. Paper presented at the International Conference on Computer and Information Technology in Physics Education, Manila, Philippines.

Handelsman, J., Ebert-May, D., Belchner, R., Bruns, P., Chang, A., DeHaan, R., Gentile, Keller, H. E., & Keller, E. E. (2005). Making real virtual labs. *The Science Education Review*, *4*(1), 1-12.

Kelly, J. (2000). Rethinking the elementary science methods course: a case for content, pedagogy, and informal science education. *International Journal of Science Education*, *22*, 755-777.

Kulik, J. A. (2002). *School mathematics and science programs benefit from instructional Technology* (Report No. 03-301). Washington DC: National Science Foundation Directorate of Social Behavior and Economic Science.

Lowery, L. (1998). How new science curriculums reflect brain research. *Educational Leadership*, *56*, 26-30.

National Research Council. (1996). *National science standards*. Washington DC: National Research Council.

Piaget, J. (1980). The psychogeneis of knowledge and its epistemological significance. In M. Piattelli-Palmarini (Ed.), *Language and learning* (pp. 23-34). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Redish, E.F. (2003). *Teaching physics with the physics suite*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Rieber, L.P. (2005). Multimedia Learning in Games, Simulations, and Microworlds. In R.E. Mayer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning* (pp. 549-567). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Robertson, H.J. (2003). Toward a theory of negativity: Teacher education and information and communications technology. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *54*(4), 280-296.

Ronen, M., & Eliahu, M. (1999). Simulation as a home learning environment-students' views. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *15*, 258-268.

Rutherford, F.J., & Ahlgren, A. (1990). *Science for all Americans*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Saunders, W.L. (1992). The constructivist perspective: Implications and teaching strategies for science. *School Science and Mathematics*, *92*, 136-141.

Sethi, R.J. (2005). Using virtual laboratories and online instruction to enhance physics education. *Journal of Physics Teacher Education Online*, *2*(3), 22-26.

Steinberg, R.N. (2000). Computers in teaching science: To simulate or not to simulate? *Physics Education Research, American Journal of Physics Supplement*, *68*, s37-s41.

Stieff, M., & Wilensky, U. (2003). Connected chemistry—Incorporating interactive simulations in the chemistry classroom. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, *12*(3), 285-302.

Trumper, R. (2003). The physics laboratory—a historical overview and future perspectives. *Science & Education*, *12*, 645-670.

Von Glaserfeld, E. (1992). Questions and answers about radical constructivism. In M. Pearsall (Ed.), *Scope, sequence, and coordination of secondary school science, Vol. II: Relevant research* (pp. 169-182). Washington, DC: National Science Teachers Association.

White, B., & Frederiksen, J. R. (1990). Causal model progressions as a foundation for intelligent learning environments. *Artifical Intelligence*, *42*(1), 99-157

Windschitl M., & Andre, T. (1998) Using computer simulations to enhance conceptual change: the role of constructivist instruction and student epistemological beliefs. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *35*(2), 145-160.

Yeo, S., Loss, R., Zadnik, M., Harrison, A., & Treagust, D. (2004). What do students really learn from interactive multimedia? A physics case study. *American Journal of Physics*, *72*(10), 1351-1358.

Zaharia, Zacharias. (2003). Beliefs, attitudes, and intentions of science teachers regarding the educational use of computer simulations and inquiry-based experiments in physics. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *40*(8), 792-823.

Students as Designers of Their Own Life Curricula:

Reconstruction of Experience in Education through Thoughtful Deliberative Action

Vincent E. Izuegbu
University of Illinois at Chicago

Curriculum of Life

The myopic subject matter consideration of curriculum gives a sense of a curriculum that is both distant and distinct from life. Rather than students' experiences, some educators, administrators, policy-makers regard the syllabus or sequence of topics as all that there is to curriculum. Such curricular idea suggests a demarcation between students' school and outside school experiences. This severity contributes to the loss of the educational values of students' outside school experiences in particular and their lived experiences in general.

This article addresses the need to salvage the severed situation and conceives a solution in the theory of the construction of a life curriculum. The theory is part of my contribution to the curriculum conversation. It is a notion of curriculum that administrators and policy-makers should bear in mind in developing a curriculum. It is a theory that should guide teaching and resonate in the mind of teachers as they implement the curriculum. Students also should be aware of this theory of curriculum as they learn and interact with their teachers and as they experience the world.

In the elementary and high schools, it is the responsibility of teachers to get the kids to begin to ponder about their lives in relation to the various disciplines of study. Educators focusing on life as the organizing center of curriculum can help students assimilate school syllabus within their life curricula. By constructing their life curricula, students take

charge of their own learning and lives and design their own curricula in a way that not only retrieves the educational values of their outside school experience, but also merges them with classroom inquiries and teacher interactions.

It is important to define the boundaries of the notion of a curriculum of life. To do so I will distinguish between the notion of life as curriculum and the notion of a curriculum of life. The study of life as curriculum is an enormous task that appears to have no boundaries because life involves everything. But the notion of building a curriculum of life—a deep-seated meaning that guides our being and actions—is primarily concerned with students taking charge of their own education, asking practical curricular questions, and learning from past experiences by reconstructing them in the present. Secondarily, there is the transition to curriculum of life that influences future experiences. It does not involve every aspect of life. However, the intellectual journey and conversation leading to the idea touches on different aspects of human experience.

The curriculum question has always involved a consideration of what constitutes worthy knowledge. "What knowledge is of most worth?" (Spencer, 1861, p. 5). This is a basic question in curriculum development. However, considering the nature of curriculum today and its various orientations and relations, I consider the Schubertian version more appropriate, "What is worth knowing and experiencing?" (1986, p. 411) because it does not demand that we select the most worthwhile and it certainly does not invoke Spencer's sordid, social Darwinism of self-preservation and survival of the fittest.

The curricular consideration of what is worth knowing and experiencing has existed as long as humans have considered what they should do and become. It should precede or be embedded in any educational inquiry aimed at curriculum development. Classroom teacher-student inquiry is an example of such curricular investigation. The classroom is a place where students in union with their teachers inquire about is worth knowing and experiencing in their lives. Unlike the customary subject matter consideration of curriculum, such worthy classroom practical inquiry considers all educational experiences—both school and outside school. The words "non-school" and "outside school" have sometimes been used interchangeably but I find "outside school" more suitable. This is because in "non-school" the prefix "non" gives the impression of direct opposition and such connotation does not support the idea of educational values in experiences. It also suggests an opposition to school experiences where as the adjective "outside" gives a sense of an alternative and not necessarily an opposing view.

The customary subject matter consideration (adopted by some school

systems) presents school curriculum as an enveloped package that teachers deliver to students without defying its purity. Such curricular outlook obscures the relationship between curriculum and life and does not promote teacher-student curricular inquiry. It makes teachers not realize that the curriculum question is also a question of what is worthwhile in life and that lifelong learning should be the ultimate aim of curriculum. Curriculum transcends school, and that is why Schubert (1981) suggests that educators should begin to view curriculum in a "dynamic interdependent and ecological relationship with out-of-school curriculum" (p. 185).

Life as the Organizing Center of Curriculum

The consideration of life as the organizing center of curriculum is not a new question in curriculum. For Whitehead (1929), "there is only one subject-matter for education, and that is Life in all its manifestations" (pp. 6-7). Decades later, Smith, Stanley, & Shores (1957) quoted these words of Whitehead (p. 244). Etymologically, the word education comes from the Latin *educo, educare* meaning to lead. Therefore, to educate means to lead out of ignorance of life. Whitehead put it better and defines education as "the acquisition of the art of the utilization of knowledge" (p. 4) and "the guidance of the individual towards a comprehension of the art of life" (p. 39). Bobbitt explained that human life consists in the performance of diverse activities and these activities are human experiences. He also noted that curriculum is a series of things that children and youths must do and experience. He went further and offered two definitions of curriculum:

> (1) it is the entire range of experiences, both undirected and directed, concerned in unfolding the abilities of the individual; or (2) it is the series of consciously directed training experiences that the schools use for completing and perfecting the unfoldment. (Bobbitt, 1918, p. 43)

Experience is what constitutes the curriculum. It is the essence of curriculum. No matter the demarcation between experiences, all our experiences fall within one curricular continuum—life. When Bobbitt wrote about directed and undirected experiences it seems he was referring to in and out-of-school curricula. The two constitute the entire range of the continuum of experience and that is why (even though he made the distinction) he was clever to observe that "the line of demarcation between directed and undirected training experience is rapidly disappearing" (p. 43).

Besides, the idea of life as the organizing center of curriculum could

be looked upon as an advocacy to broaden the conception of curriculum after the example of Schubert (1986) who writes:

> When we consider the fact that every human being learns from experience, and when we reflect on the sizable amounts of time students spend outside of school it is obvious that a great deal of learning transpires in non-school organizations, mass media, peer groups, homes and families, vocations, and avocations...What is needed since children and youth (all of us) learn from each of these areas is a broadened conception of curriculum. (pp. 107 & 108)

The joint idea of school and outside school experiences or curricula covers the entire range of students' life experiences. The inclusion of non-school or outside school curriculum in the idea of curriculum indicates that the meaning of life should be the organizing center of curriculum. Because the meaning of life is supposedly different for every student and no two lives are the same, students should be part of the inquiry about the curriculum that educates and directs their lives. Students' lives comprise their school and outside school experiences. Peer groups, family, religious, business, social, and cultural organizations are all outside school as well life experiences. It is proper to include these outside school experiences as part of the notion of curriculum. It is also proper (and not out of place) to focus on life as the organizing center of curriculum.

Types of Curriculum

One way of looking at the notion of curriculum of life is thinking about it as comprised of values. Students' life curricula consist of the values they have been able to cultivate and continue to construct and reconstruct from the cluster of values they have been exposed to from home, schools, peer groups, employment, religion, their reflections, etc. Thomas Hopkins (1954) made this distinction about values and he writes:

> There is a sharp distinction between the way individuals obtain and the way they build values. Children obtain values by psychic, emotional, or social contagion, usually as aspects of action in particular situations. These are the dominant or controlling tendencies in the immediate and general family environments in which they are reared. Such specific patterns are introduced by adults into their experiences at the outset in order to limit the area of activity and control the action toward their individual or group preferences. Adults deliberately groove the experiences of children into the patterns of behavior which meet their value judgments... Each individual builds his own values by thoughtful deliberative action in all life situations which he really faces. (p. 303)

This distinction sums up the process of curriculum building and at

the same time reveals the forms of curriculum in life. There is the curriculum that we obtain; the *exposed* curriculum (from Latin *adepto*: to obtain, get, acquire). There is also the curriculum that we construct and build: the *construed* or *constructed* curriculum (from Latin *construo*: to construct, build).

Exposed or Acquired Curriculum

In life, humans come across different forms of experiences in different environments. These experiences constitute different curricula that sometimes conflict with each other. There is a religious curriculum and sometimes it conflicts with school curriculum. The confusion concerning the use of contraceptives, stem cell research, abortion, and pre-marital sex are glaring examples. Religion educates us and instills a curriculum in us. T. S. Eliot articulated the religious nature of curriculum and he writes:

> Education is a subject which cannot be discussed in a void: our questions raise other questions, social, economic, financial, and political. And the bearings are on more ultimate problems even than these: to know what we want in education we must know what we want in general; we derive our theory of education from our philosophy of life. The problem turns out to be a religious one. (1952, p. 132)

There are other sources of curriculum and curricular conflict and the family is one of them. It does happen that sometimes the schoolteacher says one thing and the parent says another. Sometimes what happens in school conflicts with how parents want to bring up their children. For instance, the teacher tells a mildly sick student to stay home while the parent, in an effort to instill in the child the toughness to combat the tough conditions of life, encourages the child to go to school despite his or her mild illness. Who is correct, the teacher or the parent and what should the child believe? Messages learned from gangs, peer groups, and even the media do not at times go together with family values. Those who host various shows on television are not experts when it comes to knowledge of various inquiry areas like history, art, theatre, music, religion, medicine, sociology, law, politics, etc. Thus, there is always the possibility of miseducation from the media that conflicts with school syllabi and vice versa.

Apart from the media, individuals are in constant struggle in the society: trying to find their identity in it. The employee is also struggling in the place of employment. Due to the nature of the world economy today, many people find themselves in positions they dislike. Such people do what they do to survive even when they do not find it pleasing. This

is sad to say, but since 9/11 and the economic decline that followed, it appeared that the teaching profession (especially in the elementary and secondary education) became a professional safe haven for some people. Some who lost their jobs embraced the alternative means of teacher certification. Some of these professionally dislocated teachers wake up sad every school day worrying about how to control the kids and mange the classroom. There is always this experience of conflict between such teachers and teaching itself.

Married people and unmarried partners also experience conflicts. It is true that marriage joins two people together but at the same time, no two people have the same opinion in all issues. There are conflicts in opinions, beliefs, values, teachings, and ethics, which tend to tear the partners apart from time to time. This is more serious when the two partners are adherents and staunch members of conflicting religious sects.

Apart from joint conflicts, people also experience conflicts on the personal and epistemological levels. In our silent and reflective moments, the internal senses are operative. Sometimes the conclusions of our reflective and internal senses are in conflict with the concupiscence of the external senses. The former says one thing and the latter does another. Inability to resolve and integrate the conflicting experiences of life can lead to a miseducative curriculum or no curriculum at all. Cultivating a curriculum of life is a process of finding meaning amongst conflicting experiences. The overall purpose of the school curriculum is to educate students on how to integrate various curricula that come their way. James B. Macdonald touched on this point and he writes:

> The school does not exist primarily to inculcate our cultural heritage, not principally to develop role players for society nor primarily to meet the needs and interests of the learners. The school exits to bring learners in contact with (*the learner's own appreciation of the world*) reality, of which our society, ourselves, and our cultural heritage are parts. (1964, p. 47, words in italics and bracket are mine)

The reality referred to above is the learner's appreciation of the world in the learner's way and manner of perceiving and knowing, and on that note, I define curriculum studies as a study of the organization of the experiences that inform our lives and the basis from which we build our convictions and actions.

Construed or Constructed Curriculum

The constructed curriculum introduces the discussion on reconstruction of experience. The constructed curriculum is the curriculum that students consciously select from the *exposed* curriculum. This selec-

tion process is by systematic and thoughtful deliberation on the *exposed* curricula that have influenced students' lives in meaningful ways. This process of constructing meaning is a continuous one, in which case, life becomes a series of meaningful ideals. Even the ideals of one person can be reconstructed to become that of another when two persons come into a meaningful contact. In some real life situations, in substance abuse therapy for instance, long lasting results have been noticed when substance abusers acted in accordance with their therapist's advice not simply because they were advised to do so. Rather, because the substance abusers reconstructed their therapist's advice by embodying it, that is, deliberating on it, finding it meaningful, and lastly making it theirs. This ownership admits the therapist's advice into the substance abusers' life curricula, and became part and parcel of their persons. In other words, the substance abusers acted the way they did because they chose to do so. Such can also be said of a good teacher-student curricular interaction.

In the above instance, the therapist's advice was an *exposed* curriculum that also became a construed curriculum. Without reconstructing and owning the therapist's advice, substance abusers act unconvincingly and easily yield to the temptations of their environments. This is due to the lack of the immense power of action and restraint that comes with thoughtful deliberation on experience.

Reconstruction of Experience through Thoughtful Deliberative Action

Here I rely on the theories of Dewey, Pinar and Grumet, and Husserl to demonstrate that it is through thoughtful deliberative action that experiences are reconstructed in the present. Looking closely, the thoughtful deliberative action talked about by Thomas Hopkins is an important part of the Deweyan notion of reconstruction of experience. Dewey defined education as "the reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (Dewey, 1916, p. 76). Although Dewey did not explicitly use the phrase "thoughtful deliberative action," we construct meaning by reconstructing our experience through thoughtful deliberation on experience.

In Dewey, not all experience is educative. There are educative and miseducative experiences. A miseducative experience is one that has the effect of distorting the growth of further experience (1938, p. 25). In an educative experience, the principle of *continuity* of experience is operative: every experience takes up something from those that have gone before and modifies the quality of those that come after (p. 35). In

addition "every experience influences to some degree the objective conditions under which further experiences are had" (p. 37). There is also the principle of *interaction:* objective conditions are not subordinated but ordered in a kind of interaction with the immediate internal states of the experiencing individual (p. 42). The principles of continuity and interaction constitute the criteria of experience—the educative significance and value of an experience. They unite and intercept each other and are the longitudinal and lateral aspects of experience.

In the discussion of a life curriculum in the light of Deweyan reconstruction of experience, a consideration of Pinar's and Grumet's philosophy of *currere* seems *ad rem* (fitting to the thing). *Currere* is a meditative imagination of the possibilities of the future through a regressive and progressive analysis of the past and present. *Currere* rests on the phenomenological *epoch* of Edmund Husserl. Through a method of "bracketing", empirical data are removed from further consideration. "I may accept it only after I have placed it in the bracket" (Husserl, 1931, p. 111). This leaves pure consciousness, pure phenomenon, and pure Ego as the phenomenological residue. Everything including the marvels of science and technology have all been reduced to pure consciousness, placed in brackets, and suspended without judgment.

Likewise, in the construction of a life curriculum, after an experience what remains during the thoughtful deliberation is the phenomenological residue of experience. As students deliberate whether to admit the meaning of an experience into their life curricula, empirical data of the experience is removed from further investigation by placing it in brackets. Judgment is suspended until after deliberation and meaning making. This is the importance and curricular implication of the Husserlian phenomenology.

Pinar and Grumet enumerate four moments important to *currere*: regressive, progressive, analytical, and synthetical. They summarized the four methods thus:

> The first step of *currere* is the regressive, the free associative remembrance of the past. We work to excavate the present by focusing on the past, work to get underneath my everyday interpretation of what I experience, and enter experience more deeply. The next step, the progressive, asks me to ponder meditatively the future, in order to uncover my aspiration, in order to ascertain where I am moving. Third, I analyze what I uncover in the first two sections, an analysis devoted to intuitive comprehension as well as cognitive codification. I work to get a handle on what I've been and what I imagine myself to be, so that I can wield this information, rather than it wielding me. The beginning of agency. Now the antithesis, the synthetical stage. More

> deeply, now, in the present, I choose what of it to honor, what of it to let go. I choose again who it is I aspire to be, how I wish my life history to read. I determine my social commitments; I devise my strategies: whom to work with, for what, how. (1976, p. ix)

On a closer look, *currere* is related to Dewey's definition of education. Schubert made a similar observation when he identified Deweyan reconstruction of experience with Pinar and Grumet's reconconceptualization of experience (2004, p. 19). When Dewey wrote about reorganization or reconstruction of experience, I suppose he was talking about looking back on an experience (or our past in general) that we already had. Just as Pinar and Grumet rightly pointed out, it is like a phenomenological moment when we bracket certain existence or experience *in order to give ourselves standing presence* (p. 35, words in italics are mine). Therefore, when we reconstruct, we look back into the past while standing in the present. This is actually the regressive and the progressive moments of *currere*. The Deweyan analytic moment is that moment when the reconstructed experience adds to the meaning of experience itself. It does so by the examination of lived experience and existential data. The Deweyan synthetic moment is that moment when analytic result of a reconstructed experience increases the ability to direct the course of subsequent experience.

The dialectic character of *currere* is interesting. It seems dialectic when the past is antithetically analyzed with the present in the hope of a future that is synthetic of the past and present. Living and experiencing is an on-going process. It does not end with this one experience. In the same vein, each synthetic experience at some point becomes a present and a past, and by so being offers itself for analytic evaluation and synthetic appraisal and the process continues.

Transition to a Curriculum of Life

Louise Rosenblatt (1986) wrote that, "meaning does not reside ready-made in the text or in the reader, but happens during the transaction between reader and text" (p. 6). Every experience is a text of its own. Words do not mean, it is the individual that means through words. Even individuals can consider themselves as texts. For Dewey, "to learn from experience" is to make backward and forward connection between what we do to things and what we enjoy or suffer from things in consequence" (1916, p. 140). In an experience, the individual interacts with the environment and constructs meaning out of that experience. This meaningful ideal is what connects the incoming experience.

In order for students to use their education to guide their lives,

I consider it helpful that students ask themselves how they came to be who they are. What curriculum are they made of and how often do they consciously bring their curricular meanings to their experiences and interactions with the environment? The meaning of life is a living curriculum that brings together all our life experiences and sometimes resolves the conflicting ones into a curricular format that terminates in a human this or that person.

Life is all about dealing with our trials while living out our potentials. Students can increase their potentials by learning from their experiences. Every experience (whether good or bad) should be a stepping-stone toward achieving goals in life. The teleological nature of life is based upon meaning making. Life becomes hopeless without the possibility of more meaningful future experiences. It is the meanings and curricula that students construct from experiences that close the gap between the students and their goals. Constructing a curriculum of life helps students pay attention to their experiences in a way that they are able to retrieve the educational values of those meaningful past experiences.

The quest for the meaning of life is the organizing center of the curriculum. We bring something to a future experience and at the same time, we walk away with something. What we take away from an experience becomes part of our life and part of what we bring to a future experience. Life is interplay between what we bring to an experience and what we obtain from experience. It is a dialectical process. As humans, we approach each experience with an already-made curriculum (or a thesis curriculum) and at the same time, we improve our curriculum by learning from the coming together of the thesis curriculum that we are and the incoming experience (or the antithetical curriculum). The result is a synthesis, which may be a new and improved curriculum. This synthetically new and possibly improved curriculum becomes the new thesis and current curriculum while the immediate future experience becomes the antithesis, and the cyclic process continues throughout life. The antithetical and synthetical curricula are adaptations of the thesis curriculum—prompted by the changes and demands of the environment.

Reconstruction as Artistic Adaptation to Changes in the Environment

There is an arrangement that comes with the interconnection and reconstruction of experiences. Dewey in his definition of education also referred to it as reorganization. To arrange or reorganize is an artistic practice. The reconstruction and rearrangement of experience is a work of art. The curriculum is an art. Art does not stand in isolation to human

experience. It is a participation in the environment. It is a response to various stimuli from the environment. Dewey (1934) puts it well when he writes, "every experience is the result of interaction between a live creature and some aspect of the world in which he lives" (pp. 43-44). "Work of art is generated when the living organism interacts with the environment, an interaction which when carried to the full, becomes a participation and a communication with the environment" (p. 22). In the same manner, students can think of curriculum as living participation and communication with the their environments. The challenges and demands of the environment prompt the nature of this romance between the student and the environment. Art is the arrangement of experience and so is the curriculum. However, it is a misconception to think that art and experience constitute primarily in arrangement or sequence.

The conception that the essence of curriculum lies in the sequence of topics appears to be part of the problem with curriculum development today. In some classrooms and state boards of education, there is always this myopic conception of curriculum as a sequence of topics where one topic necessarily follows another. There is so much emphasis on what should be taught first and what comes after that rather than on students' experiences themselves. The curriculum is not a sequence of experiences rather *it is experience itself.* If curriculum is a pathway to knowledge, then that pathway is experience and nothing else. Any pathway to knowledge created by any particular sequence is composed of experiences. Different autonomous and independent experiences are united in the line of the path that leads to knowledge. "Every successive part flows freely, without seam and without unfilled blanks, into what ensues. At the same time there is no sacrifice of self-identity of the parts" (Dewey, p. 36).

Given the foregoing, there is need for fluidity in our curriculum. The fluidity of curriculum has to do with centering our classroom education in such a way that its beginning slips off from students' experiences and slides right back into them. Lesson plans should be made in such a way that classroom experiences become a continuation of life experiences. Pinar (2004) imagined a similar situation when he asked, "What would the curriculum look like if we centered the school subjects in the autobiographical histories and reflections of those who undergo them?" (p.38). William and Ann Schubert (1981) urged educators to "develop ways to form curricula with students so that learning activities come from within them as well as from without" (p. 250). When classroom experiences are interwoven with daily life experiences, students stand better chance of seeing schooling as a continued part and parcel of their lives. This would probably lessen the number of dropouts in our schools.

Whether we consider curriculum as experience or the components

of the path to knowledge as experience, there is a primacy and immediacy enjoyed by human experience in so far as human knowledge is concerned. If art is the conveyance of feelings in the experience of the environment, and if art is experience and the curriculum too is experience, one is inclined to reason without any fear of fallacy that curriculum is the conveyance of feelings in the adaptation to the growing demands and changes in the environment. Our experiences proceed from the adaptation to the changes in the environment which may not necessarily mean a change in life curriculum.

Procession of Experiences

Given the emphasis on life curriculum, one wonders if the curriculum of life bears upon and informs all future experiences. We expect our actions to flow from the convictions, ideals, and values that we have established for ourselves but this is not always the case. Sometimes we behave in certain ways that we begin to question ourselves and our motives. In the language of Dewey, we keep reconstructing and reorganizing our experiences; and our meaning about life keeps evolving. Today, we look at life this way and the next day we look at it differently. However, at any point in our lives, whatever meaning we make of life is an assemblage of all the experiences that we have had up until that moment in our lives.

Thus, the assemblage, arrangement, sequence, interconnections, and above all, interpretation of our experiences are responsible for our convictions and meaning making in life. Depending on the level of our convictions, our ability to direct the course of subsequent experience (in the language of Dewey) is either increased or diminished. If our convictions are strong, subsequent experiences are assumed, overshadowed, and predicted by our prior understanding of life and not necessarily prior experience.

Smith, Stanley, and Shores wrote about value system in their discussion of the fundamentals of curriculum development. They pointed out that people express two kinds of beliefs: one in reference to what a given set of circumstances actually is, or was, and the other, to what it ought to be or ought to have been (1957, p. 59). People frequently express their values as maxims based on their factual statements (whether true or false) about a situation and what the situation ought to have been. In this ethical consideration of curriculum, the maxims are sometimes different from the actual situations. The factual statements are products of our external senses while the maxims are products of our internal senses—particularly the intellect. There is sometimes a *disconnect* between the intellect and the external senses. The intellect builds upon the factual statements of

the external senses, rises beyond them, and formulates the maxims. The maxims of the value system serve as the rule of conduct or basis for judging people's behavior including oneself. The fact that behaviors and rules guiding behaviors proceed from different sources explains why a person believes one thing but sometimes does another. The saying "what am I doing?" is an indication and a realization of a conflict of sources. This is a point when the ideal maxim of the intellect is kicking in and questioning the behavior. The intellect by doing so makes one realize that one has gone contrary to one's established rule of conduct.

What this tells us is that not all of our experiences proceed from our curricula of lives. Sometimes the frailty of the flesh can redirect the source of our actions. Instead of acting in accordance with our maxims, we dance to the tunes of the flesh. It is only when the flesh is led by the intellect or rather when both are guided by a common understanding that we can achieve an absolute unity of curriculum and action. One's life curriculum changes at any point one's subsequent experiences are not directed by one's prior overall understanding of life. For this change to happen, the incoming experience must be so overwhelming to direct the arrangement and interconnection of all prior experiences in its favor.

Conclusion

Constructing a life curriculum: so what and who cares? Human life is a phenomenon that is shrouded in mysteries. Sometimes when we think we are closing in on it, the more it appears to get away from us and our findings become only an uncovering of mysteries and inconsistencies. There is always this constant struggle between us and the world as presented to us. The world-as-it-is, unthought-of and unexamined, always tries to overwhelm our existence. Nevertheless, in our resolve to untwist and unravel its machinations, we hold it, supplant it, and configure it to our pleasing. This we do on the scientific as well as on the personal levels. The two go hand in hand. There is a difference between the way humans want to live their lives and the way nature entraps them into living their lives and that is why the construction of a life curriculum is relevant. A life curriculum is also relevant because not enough attention has been paid to experience. I have been a mental health and crisis worker for almost five years now and have seen a lot of people come in and out of the emergency room due to an inability to learn from experience. Some people dwell on the hurtful part of certain experiences without tapping into the educational values of such experiences. Mistakes are repeated and the result is more hurtful feelings and nothing learned and advanced forward.

A curriculum of life is not an intellectual articulation of the meaning of life. It is a deep-seated meaning that informs behavior and builds character through skills, knowledge, and dispositions acquired in life. It is a meaning that resides and evolves in the innermost recesses of our being. It relates our knowing and meaning to our doing, behaving, living, and acting. This meaning, knowing, acting, and behaving do not come from this or that single experience. They derive from an integrated ensemble of all experiences: that momentary pause and halt, the wondering and pondering that initiates an experience into a life curriculum. Marriage, relationships, schooling, parenting, religion, employment, science and technology, business and everything else have all been absolved and resolved into the notion of a life curriculum. Without thoughtful deliberation, an indelible experience becomes stale and meaningless. This is an attitude that should be fostered by teachers and brought to bear on practical curriculum inquiry in the classroom.

Summarily, the idea of life as a curriculum is an invitation to extend the notion of curriculum to include outside school curriculum (Schubert) and to emphasize life as the organizing center of curriculum. This is because we build new values (Hopkins) by reconstructing (Dewey) the values we obtain from all our experiences (Hopkins) in a way that influences our future life (Pinar's and Grumet's *currere*). Just as Schubert (p.108), advocated for the evaluation of outside school experiences with Tyler's rationale, the same rationale can as well be used in analyzing the curricular implications of life experiences in general.

Lastly, the curricular conception of a life curriculum is not an aggressive effort to answer the curriculum question or articulate with exactitude the question and meaning of life. Rather it is only an attempt to shed more light on the nature of the question itself and provide another way of thinking about it. The question of curriculum and other questions of its kind are not simple issues, raising the questions and pondering about them is sometimes better than the answers themselves.

References

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.

Dewey, J. (1931). *The way out of educational confusion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Perigee Books.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Touchstone.

Eliot, T.S. (1952). Modern education and the class. In *Social Criticism*. London, UK: Penguin.

Hopkins, T. (1954). *Emerging self in society*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas*. London, UK: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Macdonald, J. (1964). An image of man: The learner himself. In Doll, R. (Ed.), *Individualizing Instruction* (pp. 29-40). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Pinar, W. F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory*? Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pinar, W. F., & Grumet, M. (1976). *Towards a poor curriculum*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (2000). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1986). Writing and reading: The transactional theory. Paper IL, presented at the conference on reading and writing connections, Urbana-Champaign, October 19-21.

Schubert, W. H. (1981). Knowledge about out-of-school curriculum. *Educational Forum*, *45*(2), 185-199.

Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Schubert, W.H. (1989). On the practical value of practical inquiry for teachers and students. *Journal of Thought, 24*(1&2), 41-74.

Schubert, W. H., & Schubert, A. L. (1981). Toward curricula that are of, by, and therefore for students. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *3*(1), 239-251.

Schubert, W.H., Schubert, A.H., Thomas, T.P., & Carroll, W. M. (2002).*Curriculum books: The first hundred years* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.

Schubert, W.H. (2004). Curriculum and pedagogy for reconstruction and reconceptualization. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 1*(1), 19-21.

Short, E. (Ed.). (1991). *Forms of curriculum inquiry*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J.H., (1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *The Aims of education*. New York: The Free Press.

Frequently Asked Questions about Journal of Thought

(Continued from page 8)

How long does it take for a manuscript to be published after it is accepted for publication?

The time frame for publication after a manuscript has been accepted varies depending upon a variety of variables. For example, thematic and guest editor issues are often published at a slower pace than are non-thematic issues. Generally, however, manuscripts are published within twelve months after the time an author is notified that her or his manuscript has been accepted for publication.

May an article that was initially not accepted be submitted to the journal again after revisions?

Yes, however it is recommended that authors do not resubmit manuscripts if the reviewers' feedback indicates that the research is inappropriate for the *Journal of Thought* and its readership.

Can an article that has already been published, but that has been updated, be considered for publication?

Ordinarily, no. Conversely, studies that are based upon prior research but which are substantively different in a current article draft are welcomed. To be *substantively different*, the current research study must be significantly different in methodology, findings, and/or conclusions.

How can I get a back issue of the *Journal of Thought*?

Please contact Caddo Gap Press. See Subscription Information on page 144 for details.

A Case against Heightened Self-Esteem as an Educational Aim

Jack Martin
Simon Fraser University

During the latter part of the twentieth-century and into the twenty-first century, educational systems have increasingly placed a high value on heightened self-esteem as an important aim of education. After all, who of us would want our children not to feel as good about themselves as possible, especially when leading educational researchers proclaim that self-esteem provides a crucial building block on which all our actions and experiences are based. "People who think positively about themselves are healthier, happier, and more productive ... self-concept is fundamental to enhancing human potential, from early development and school achievement, to physical/mental health and wellbeing, to cultural identity and social justice" (Shavelson, 2003, p. xiii). The corollary is that low self-esteem is responsible for almost all individual and social difficulties. So pervasive is this phenomenon that many contemporaries "cannot think of a single psychological problem—from anxiety and depression, to fear of intimacy or of success, to spouse battery or child molestation—that is not traceable to the problem of low self-esteem" (Branden, 1984, p. 12). Given that self-esteem has such profound consequences for every aspect of our existence, it would be unpardonable for schools, educators, and educational researchers to neglect the cultivation of this core human resource. Thus, it is not surprising to find a dramatic and steady increase in research reports and writings about self-esteem cited in major databases such as ERIC, PsycINFO, and Web of Science from 1960 to the present.

Nonetheless, an important attitude of free inquiry is a willingness to put even our most trusted bromides to conceptual, theoretical, and

empirical analysis and evaluation. When self-esteem has been examined in this way, the results and interpretations forthcoming have been much less conclusive than the foregoing statements and sentiments proclaim. In what is perhaps the most comprehensive evaluative review of research and theory concerning the educational and social effects of high self-esteem, Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, and Vohs (2003) reach the following general conclusions:

> The benefits of high self-esteem fall into two categories: enhanced initiative and pleasant feelings. We have not found evidence that boosting self-esteem (by therapeutic interventions or school programs) causes benefits. Our findings do not support continued widespread efforts to boost self-esteem in the hope that it will by itself foster improved outcomes. (p. 1)

Of added relevance to education and schooling is their further conclusion that "the modest correlations between self-esteem and school performance do not indicate that high self-esteem leads to good performance. Instead, high self-esteem is partly the result of good school performance" (p. 1) (also see Kohn, 1994).

Although extremely helpful, there is a tendency in such evaluations to give priority to empirical issues and data, as if these alone might resolve the complex social and educational matters at stake. However, questions of educational aims cannot be decided on empirical bases alone, as vital as such information obviously is. For example, given evidence that "self-esteem does lead to greater happiness" (Baumeister et al., 2003, p. 1), should it be promoted actively in schools despite evidence that "efforts to boost the self esteem of pupils have not been shown to improve academic performance and may sometimes be counterproductive" (Baumeister et al., 2003, p. 1)? Any possible resolution of questions such as this requires a turn to educational argument that involves conceptual, theoretical, and critical consideration. As a prelude to such consideration, it is helpful to place our current focus on the self-esteem of students within an historical context that makes connections to the cultural evolution of both educational aims and conceptions of selfhood. Such contextualizing enables a critical reinterpretation of reasons and arguments for advancing heightened self-esteem as an educational aim, which, in turn, suggests alternative possibilities to safeguard the personal and social development of pupils.

Self-Esteem in Historical Context

It is difficult for most contemporaries to imagine that selfhood and self-esteem, understood as aspects of personhood that are central to our existence as individuals with others, are relatively recent arrivals on

the cultural, historical landscape. In English, the word "self," used as a noun, first appeared around 1300, and from then until near the end of the seventeenth century, had primarily negative connotations as a kind of blasphemous arrogance that improperly challenged religious and social orders of the day (Danziger, 1997). However, by 1694, John Locke, in the second edition of his famous *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, was able to discuss the self and personal identity in predominately secular terms as an internal focus or point from which individuals could witness and monitor their experiences (Taylor, 1989). Since Locke, human consciousness has become imbued with a self-consciousness that accompanies many or most of our experiences and actions. As a consequence, as selves, we do not *live* in our actions and experiences so much as we possess or *own* them. By the early eighteenth century, the core idea of the self as an "experiencer" (an owner and evaluator of experience) had become associated with a wide set of self compounds, like self-esteem, that gradually had come to occupy secular and positive connotations in everyday speech and activity (Toulmin, 1977).

The self had been invented (Lyons, 1978), and from this time onward, the flow of approval and disapproval that attended the social activities of individuals was understood as directed at their selves, rather than at their specific actions. One important consequence of this linguistic, conceptual, and experiential revolution was that the language of self-evaluation shifted away from conceptions of guilt and sin toward ideas of blameworthiness and self-esteem. Today, the "objectified self that persons now harbor within them is above all an object of approval and disapproval, both by others and by the person herself. This self is always conceived as an object of variable worth, and therefore the desire to raise or maintain its worth comes to be regarded as an identifiable human motive" (Danziger, 1997, p. 143). By the early eighteenth century, even some religious leaders, like Bishop Butler (1726/1950), had concluded that the main trouble with humanity was not that people had an over-abundance of self-love, but that they had too little of the right kind of self-regard.

The idea of "the right kind of self-love" received a highly unique rendering in the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, regarded by many as the father of modern progressive education and developmental psychology (Mayer, 1966). Rousseau believed that human beings are naturally inclined toward a form of self-love (*amour de soi*) that is centered around caring for one's self in a manner that blends easily with a genuine concern and sympathy for others, but that this natural self-love is corrupted by societal demands and expectations for individuals to compete with each other for resources and prestige. Society thus breeds a kind of vanity and self-importance (*amour-propre*) that diminishes and twists

authentic self-love and compassion for others. Rousseau produced highly original and influential writings in political and educational theory that advanced possible ways of limiting the corrupting influences of society on its members. The primary purpose of his educational theorizing was "to prevent amour de soi from turning into amour-propre, for this is the true source of man's dividedness" (Bloom, 1979, p. 10). To this end, Rousseau (1762/1979) proposes a developmentally graduated form of education that promotes the self-satisfaction of persons of equality in a way consistent with their natural tendencies toward amour de soi. To avoid premature confrontation with others' wills in a way that would lead to overly strong forms of amour-propre, Rousseau insisted that the early education of the child should be structured in such a manner so that the child will always do what she wants, but that what she wants to do will be what is educationally appropriate. The teacher's role is to arrange judiciously chosen activities to ensure that the child is not required to make social comparisons with others before she is satisfied with herself and truly concerned with others. Since the publication of *Émile* (or *On Education*) in 1762, Rousseau's emphasis on the interests and self-love of the child has influenced more than two centuries of "progressive education," earlier forms of which tended to retain his emphasis on moral and political education, but latter forms of which sometimes have tended to take more decidedly psychological directions.

Although there is considerable debate concerning the precise nature of agreements and disagreements among various educational doctrines that might be included under the banner of progressive education (e.g., Adelman, 2000), it most often is held that Rousseau's ideas initiated and, in many ways, sustained the movement. "Pestalozzi, Herbart, Froebel, the Macmillans, Montessori, Caldwell, Cook, Dewey are his [Rousseau's] successors; and such devices as the Nursery School [Kindergarten], the Dalton Plan, the Play Way, and the Project Method are the practical results of what they taught" (Jacks, 1950). In particular, his emphasis on the interests, activities, and development of pupils gradually became enshrined in a general form of education that focused on the whole person, individual differences in interests and abilities, and learning by doing, especially through play and concrete, problem solving situations. Even more influential was his over-arching concern for the authentic self-esteem of the learner as a buffer against the potentially invidious comparisons with others that are encouraged by traditional modes of education and society in general.

Well-known educators like Pestalozzi, Herbart, and Froebel established the first non-traditional schools and kindergartens in Switzerland and Germany in the late 1700s and early 1800s, and developed a variety

of neo-Rousseauian educational theories and methods. In different ways and with different emphases, all grappled with the tensions between nature and society, self and others, and personal freedom and civic duty/virtue. Many of their educational concerns were highly moral and political—so much so, that several of their followers (especially those of Froebel) arrived in the United States around 1868 as refugees from political ferments in Europe in which their educational ideas were interpreted as threats to church and state (Adelman, 2000).

The moral and political tenor of the early European progressives received an influential rendering in the educational writings of John Dewey, who together with his wife Alice, daughter Evelyn, and colleagues like George Herbert Mead, became immersed in a variety of educational experiments, including the establishment and running of the famous Laboratory School sponsored by the University of Chicago. The educational plan adopted in the Chicago Laboratory School was based initially on Froebel's kindergarten, albeit with a more explicitly social and pragmatic rendering, and consisted largely of following and responding to the child's nature (Deegan, 1999). Although Dewey's emphasis on children's play and interests frequently was interpreted as a misplaced abandonment of more traditional educational aims and methods, Dewey was primarily concerned with achieving a social democratic via media between what too frequently are cast as oppositional polarities, such as curriculum content versus learner interest, and self versus community. For example, in a succinct response to his critics (Dewey, 1938), he makes it clear that starting with the life experience and interests of the child in no way precludes ending with the organized subject-matter of the established disciplines.

> The utilization of subject-matter found in the present life-experience of the learner ... is perhaps the best illustration that can be found of the basic principle of using existing experience as the means of carrying learners on to a wider, more refined, and better organized environing world, physical and human, than is found in the experiences from which educative growth sets out. (p. 82)

In a similar manner, starting by safeguarding the self-interest and self-esteem of the learner in no way precludes ending with community involvement and interest in others. Most of Dewey's educational writings are concerned with describing in theoretical detail the conditions and processes involved in such educational transformations.

Progressive emphases on the nature, development, and self-esteem of the child also held considerable attraction to the developing discipline of psychology. By the early twentieth century, the ideas not only of Rousseau, but also of Darwin, Freud, and others had created a theoretical

and practical niche within which psychology could develop rapidly as a social science and profession that claimed unique expertise in matters relating to the self (cf. Baumeister, 1987; Cushman, 1995, Herman, 1995). The burgeoning presence of psychology in educational and other social institutions received enormous support from the opening up of the new field of personality psychology, which quickly became joined to social, developmental, and educational branches of the discipline. Perhaps no single psychologist was more directly responsible for establishing a psychological science of personality and selfhood than Gordon Allport (1937), an individual who directly and indirectly influenced subsequent generations of psychologists and educational psychologists concerned with both self-expression and self-management.

> Allport mapped out a self that reflected the new realities of industrial, urban America. This was a self that could be known, governed, managed; it was a self that could be embraced by employers and officialdom and one to which upwardly mobile individuals could aspire. Paradoxically, this was also a self that promised liberation from standardization and a heightened level of individuality. Individual measurement would transform an intangible value—individuality—into an empirical reality and in the process would free Americans from the sociological straitjacket of group-based categories. (Nicholson, 2003, pp. 100-101)

Allport's central contribution was to advance an approach to selfhood that combined concern for scientific rigor and control with humanistic impulses for self-development and fulfillment.

In the 1950s and 1960s, humanistic psychologists like Abraham Maslow (1954) and Carl Rogers (1957) reacted against the prevailing behaviorism of the day, and spear-headed a renewed focus on internal processes in psychology, with an emphasis on individually unique, affectively laden experiences. In educational psychology, numerous studies began to focus attention on the self-esteem and self-concept of school children, often in terms of congruency between self descriptions and self ideals (e.g., Long, Henderson, & Ziller, 1967; Soares & Soares, 1969). Others focused on relationships between measures of self-concept/self-esteem and academic achievement and motivation, a focus that continues into the present day (e.g., Wigfield & Karpathian, 1991). What is perhaps most interesting about the vast literature concerning self-concept and self-esteem in school contexts is that although it was initiated by humanistic impulses to recognize the uniqueness and emotional experience of children in school settings, it quickly evolved through mergers with more traditionally scientific forms of psychology and educational psychology, much as Allport's pioneering work in personality and selfhood had presaged.

One such merger was with psychometricians who developed numer-

ous scales and subscales for the measurement of self-esteem and self-concept during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s (e.g., Piers & Harris, 1964). A second merger occurred once the cognitive revolution in psychology and applied psychology had taken a firm hold in education by the late 1960s, and involved a new breed of cognitive psychologists interested in structures and operations of cognition in classroom settings that included motivational and affective components (e.g., Shavelson & Bolus, 1982). By the dawn of the twenty-first century, approximately 3,000 studies of self-esteem and/or self-concept were listed in the ERIC database (Martin, 2004). Many of these examined the factor structure and psychometric properties of an expanding array of measures and scales (e.g., Byrne & Shavelson, 1986; Winne & Walsh, 1980). Many also examined relationships among measures of self-esteem/self-concept, academic achievement and motivation, and a number of other personality variables (e.g., Ames & Felkner, 1979; Jordan, 1981).

The self experiences of learners that are described and rated in what have become standard measures of self-esteem and self-concept such as *The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale*, the *Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory*, and the *Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale for Children* contain items (respectively) such as: "I feel that I do not have much to be proud of," "All in all, I'm inclined to feel that I'm a failure," and "I am good in my school work." Although self-esteem sometimes is differentiated from self-concept in that the former is a judgment of one's self-worth while the latter is a description of one's self-understanding, many scales and studies of self-esteem and self-concept conflate these distinctions (Greer, 2003), unless one assumes that inclusion or exclusion of the words "I feel that" in items such as those just cited is sufficient to capture the difference between a judgment of self-worth and a description of self-understanding. At any rate, the now voluminous literature in educational psychology that has accumulated around the promotion of the self-esteem and self-concepts of school children and adolescents generally places a high premium on self-discovery, self-expression, and self-fulfillment without much explicit discussion of broader educational aims, or social, cultural, moral, and political contexts of education.

An ever expanding panoply of psychoeducational interventions now is in place in most North American school systems that targets enhanced self-esteem as a primary goal, quite independently of any other educational aims (cf. Canfield & Wells, 1994; McDaniel & Bielen, 1990). With the wide-spread acceptance of these products of psychological science and practice by educators and the general public in Western societies, self-expression and individual fulfillment now stand as educational aims in their own right, separated from, and sometimes seemingly in

competition with, institutional aims of schooling that traditionally have emphasized citizenship as an active, effective participation in the political, economic, sociocultural, and moral practices that constitute life with others within communities and nations (Olson, 2003). Even when such more long-standing aims of education are mentioned by proponents of self-concept and self-esteem, they now are likely to be treated as derivative from these apparently more important inner, psychological resources.

> A positive self-concept is widely considered fundamental for psychological health, personal achievement, and positive relationships. Self-concept is thought to make such a difference, that people who think positively about themselves are healthier, happier, and more productive. Hence, enhancing self-concept is considered necessary to maximizing human potential, from early development and school achievement, to physical/mental health and well being, to gainful employment and other contributions to society. (Craven, Marsh, & Burnett, 2003, p. 96)

Critical Considerations

But, is the educational cultivation of enhanced self-concept and self-esteem really capable of contributing to personal and social betterment in the manner envisioned by so many contemporary educators? As mentioned earlier, several scholars recently have challenged the empirical basis for such an assertion (e.g., Baumeister et al., 2003; Kohn, 1994). However, there also are important conceptual, theoretical, and critical considerations that mitigate against such a sweeping conclusion.

In a recent discussion of contemporary conceptions of authentic self-expression and fulfillment, Charles Guignon (2004) noted that the authentic person in contemporary society is thought of as one who understands her own feelings and expresses them transparently in her actions. However, Guignon challenges the idea that authenticity is only a matter of inner, emotional experience and expression. He points out that authenticity also requires a commitment backed by reason. Importantly, he goes on to argue that any such reasoned commitment only can arise in the context of shared practices and values within a social context. Charles Taylor (1991) makes a similar point in recognizing that any human agent who seeks significance and meaning in life must exist within a horizon of important questions, and that such a horizon only is available within an historically established, sociocultural way of life. The upshot of such reasoning is that personally and socially productive forms of self-expression and self-fulfillment, of the sort envisioned by Branden (1994), Canfield and Wells (1994), Craven et al. (2003), McDaniel and Bielen (1990), and so many others cannot issue from the activities of

an isolated, detached psychological self, attentive primarily to its own internal experiences and feelings.

Democratic organizations (classrooms, schools, communities, and nations) only work when their members exercise discernment and judgment with respect to at least some shared goals and beliefs. When someone does not stand behind her beliefs, she fails to sustain a democratic social system that is predicated on exactly that which she now fails to do. But, standing behind one's beliefs, in a manner conducive to full participation in democratic exchanges and institutions, is not primarily a matter of having elevated self-esteem. A free and democratic society is possible only if its members are committed to the unrestricted exchange of views. And, such exchange assumes that citizens are persons, with moral commitments and reasons, who are knowledgeable about the issues that confront them and their society.

Consequently, the role of education in democratic societies must be to ensure some minimally acceptable level of knowing and understanding that goes well beyond our own interiors, and attends to the world in which we live with others, and what we currently know about it (even if such knowledge is always being revised, and is never certain). In other words, authentic selfhood or personhood is possible only in the context of shared traditions, practices, and ways of life with others. When conceptions and models of self-esteem and self-concept focus only on the feelings and experiences of individuals, they provide much too narrow a venue for the education of persons and citizens.

The fact that so many proponents of self-esteem in the classroom and school have little to say about moral and political matters is indicative of the pervasive individualism that afflicts this area of contemporary educational theory, research, and practice, and its relative neglect of the social, cultural (including the moral and political) constitution and concerns of fully functioning citizens and persons. It simply is educationally unsound to hold that the fostering of self-esteem and self-concept in classrooms is an adequate basis for the preparation of students as full participants in those sociocultural contexts in which they are embedded.

Instead of encouraging students in schools to "turn inward" in ways that privilege their own experiences, feelings, and perspectives, Philippe Meirieu (2005) maintains that school is a place where children must learn to disengage from their own experiences, situations, and preoccupations through ongoing interaction with other children and the curriculum. "L'École doit aider l'enfant à renoncer à être au centre du monde" (p. 68). They must learn that there are conventions and practices of correctness and truth that resist their own desires, and that they must participate in such practices and judge themselves and others accordingly. For

Meirieu, a critical aspect of this escape from their immediate desires is learning to respect and consider other perspectives. "À l'École, on apprend à passer progressivement de son point de vue et de ses intérêts personnels à la researche du bien commun" (p. 72). Indeed, a major goal of education is to help children take and evaluate different perspectives in cooperation with others within problem situations. For Meirieu, such perspective taking is an indispensable ingredient in the development of students as persons and citizens.

Schooling provides many excellent venues for the study and facilitation of personal development as an expansion of the perspectives available to students. Taking and evaluating different perspectives encountered in formal curricula and informal classroom activities is an important part of the educational process in any society, but is especially critical for the preparation of citizens in democratic societies. The self-development of persons and citizens is not primarily a matter of turning inwards to discover one's authentic self, or of carefully cultivating a positive self-image, self-concept, or repertoire of self-regulatory strategies. As possibly useful as any of these might be, they are of limited educational value unless they make contact with perspectives available in interpersonal and community activity, including those perspectives that constitute a representative sampling of what currently are considered to be our best theories and practices in subject areas as diverse as history, mathematics, biology, athletics, and the fine and performing arts.

Tensions in the Education of Persons

The foregoing critical, conceptual, and theoretical considerations, in combination with extant challenges to empirical assumptions linking self-esteem to higher levels of academic attainment and social functioning (e.g., Baumeister et al., 2003), raise serious concerns about the adequacy of elevated self-esteem as a free-standing educational aim, or as an educational means for advancing either personal or social goals of schooling. However, by themselves, they do not suggest that the personal development of students is not a valid educational goal that might be set alongside more social aims of schooling such as the promotion of good citizenship, social contribution, and care for others. The sole conclusion that follows from what has been said thus far is that elevated self-esteem is not an educationally valid end, either in itself or by virtue of its relationship to other educational aims concerning the personal and social development of students. This conclusion may be sufficient reason to move away from classroom activities such as making a "commercial for oneself" in which students are directed to make "advertisements and commercials

to sell themselves" (Canfield & Wells, 1994, p. 125) or to participate in "realizing your uniqueness" lessons (McDaniel & Bielen, 1990, p. 156). However, the larger educational questions concerning possible tensions between, and ways of reconciling personal and social, institutional goals of schooling are not in any way decided by what has been said to this point. Since it is highly likely that the salience of concerns for elevated self-esteem in contemporary schools is related to such tensions and their resolution, a brief consideration of these matters is warranted.

Olson (2003) provides a useful point of departure for a discussion of personal development as possibly incompatible with more long-standing, institutional goals of schooling to produce graduates who are able to fit easily into the economic, political, social, and moral life of their communities.

> Although humane feelings and personal morality are important, they are not, in my view, the primary concern of the school; people have a right to think and feel as they like. The goal of the school is much more limited, namely, teaching students how to participate in the bureaucratic institutions of the larger society. Thus, students must be taught how to engage with systematic, disciplined knowledge; to understand how the rule of law imparts both entitlements and responsibilities; and to recognize how the public institutions of the society allow them to pursue and achieve their own personal or local cultural goals. Whether or not they love knowledge and empathize with others is, perhaps, less important than that they know their duty and the rights and privileges that are earned by living up to it. Schools cannot and need not reform human nature. They have a more limited responsibility, namely, teaching the young how to live in a complex society composed of institutions for knowledge, justice, the economy, and the like ... Education teaches one to live with and interact productively with others one may never have met but who share competence with a common set of institutions and a common commitment to explicit norms and standards and the rule of law. (p. 296)

Thus, in Olson's view, it is not the job of schools to teach children to love or esteem themselves, others, learning, or knowledge, or to develop personally in ways conducive to such caring. Instead, the purpose of schooling is to help children acquire knowledge and capability of participating within those shared institutional practices within which one identifies as citizen, professional, friend, colleague, and so forth. Throughout his book, Olson (2003) argues that any educational application of psychological approaches to personal development is doomed to fail unless it recognizes and accepts the institutional nature of schooling. As institutions, schools are responsible to the states that create them. Schools are charged with setting and maintaining standards, procedures, norms, and rules for learning, thinking, and knowing. What contemporary advocates of children's self-esteem seem not to understand, along with their arguably

more educationally sophisticated progressive predecessors like Dewey, is that these institutional concerns and practices with respect to learning and knowing cannot be identified with child-centered initiatives that treat learning and development as matters of learners experientially exploring their local world and culture (Olson, 2003, p. 291).

It is obvious that institutional mandates of schooling cannot be identified with the personal caprice of individual children. Nonetheless, to suggest that thoughtful progressives like Dewey (whom Olson obviously admires) are confused about social, institutional and personal, developmental goals of education seems unwarranted. In particular, such a critical assessment appears to depend on an overly strong distinction between self and society, of the sort that Dewey, together with other early American pragmatists, like George Herbert Mead, found to be untenable.

That schools are institutions with societal mandates to prepare individuals for full participation in societies is undeniable, and certainly is at odds with the elevation of enhanced self-esteem as an educational goal in the absence of demonstrable causal association with such mandates. However, beginning, at least in part, with the interests and activities of children is not necessarily incompatible in ending with the kind of social, institutional understanding and capability that Olson (2003) champions as the chief aim of schooling. In 1938, Dewey responded to critics of his educational ideas in a way that emphasized his approach to educational development as charting a trajectory from the child's interest and activity to the social, institutional participation of full and active citizenship. Here, as previously noted, he stated that his intention in beginning with subject matter found in the current life experience of the learner was in accordance with "the basic principle of using existing experience as the means of carrying learners on to a wider, more refined, and better organized environing world, physical and human, than is found in the experiences from which educative growth sets out" (p. 82).

Dewey's theory of educational development assumed a unique kind of social psychology that he borrowed in large part from George Herbert Mead. Instead of setting social reality against individual psychological development, Mead understood meaning, mind, and self-consciousness to derive mostly through participation in routine social actions with others. For Mead, such ongoing interactivity allows developing individuals to take the attitudes and perspectives of particular others and of society in general and apply them to themselves and the physical and social world (Gillespie, 2005; Martin, 2006). It is precisely because children take and react to perspectives available in the interpersonal, social activity that they become selves at all. When the constitution of selfhood through social interactivity is fully appreciated, there is no sharp divide between social

(including institutional) practices and personal psychological growth and development because the latter is cut from the cloth of the former.

Consequently, Olson is correct to suggest that the institutional mandates of schools cannot be identified with the personal experiences of students, but it is only through participation in sociocultural practices (including institutional practices) that learners develop as persons and citizens. When this is clearly understood, there is no choice other than to educate experientially, beginning with the child's experiences to date and gradually, as her understanding and capability warrant, making available an ever expanding array of social, disciplinary, and institutional perspectives with which she can interact, and through such interaction develop increasingly organized, sophisticated, and nuanced understandings of her self and the sociocultural and biophysical world.

Self development thus occurs together with educational and social development. We are immersed in social and institutional practices from birth, and our participation in them constitutes us as persons—i.e., social and moral agents with rights and responsibilities. The real tension that Olson (2003) is concerned about is not between the institutional practices of schooling and individual psychological development, but between competing sociocultural practices found in contemporary liberal, democratic societies. This is a tension between social and psychological practices that privilege individual freedom and development, and social and psychological practices that privilege civic duty and responsibility to others. The problem is that liberal democratic societies embrace both of these sets of practices and their attendant virtues. In critiquing enhanced self-esteem as an educational aim, one is critiquing a set of discernible social practices that currently are highly influential in promoting forms of personal development that are centered too narrowly on the experience of individuals in the absence of appropriately educative concerns for the expansion of such experience through contact with other understandings and perspectives. Instead of encouraging school children and adolescents to look within to find personal significance, educators and schools should always be encouraging students to expand their experience, perspectives, and understanding. If Dewey and Mead were correct, this can be done without sacrificing either personal development or the institutional mandates of school because educational development necessarily includes personal development.

Conclusion

Without evidence that the enhancement of students' self-esteem promotes greater levels of academic achievement or other distinctly

educational benefits (cf. Baumeister et al., 2003), there is little empirical support for heightened self-esteem as an educational aim. Moreover, an historical sketch of the emergence of enhanced self-esteem as an educational goal suggests that important distinctions among types of self-esteem that may be more or less educationally and socially (including morally and politically) productive gradually have been eroded in more contemporary educational inquiry and practice. Such erosion has resulted, especially in Western nations, in psychoeducational practices and interventions that may be criticized for an over emphasis on individualism. In some instances, it seems as if students are encouraged to pursue their self-interest at the expense of acquiring knowledge and understanding about, and engaging with, perspectives and interests different from their own. In consequence, the acquisition and critical consideration of a wide variety of viable and productive perspectives typical of educational development may suffer when enhanced self-esteem is isolated as a major educational aim.

Some (e.g., Olson, 2003) have argued that personal development in general (whether in the specific form of enhanced self-esteem or not) is incompatible with the institutional mandates of schools to prepare students for citizenship and productive participation in the economic, political, legal, and moral structures of their societies. However, such a position may be predicated on too strong a divide between personal development and education for civic virtue and participation. Early American pragmatists, like Dewey (1938) and Mead (1934, 1938), objected to such dualistic formulations. They pointed out that self-development was inextricably bound up with the taking, experiencing, and application of a diversity of perspectives. In this way, they tied self-development directly to the experience of points of view and modes of understanding that went beyond students' current circumstances, knowledge, and self-interest. "[E]xperience does not occur in a vacuum. There are sources outside an individual that give rise to experience. It is constantly fed from these springs" (Dewey, 1938, p. 40). From this point of view, it is not self-esteem per se that is problematic, but overly individualistic, narrow, and instrumentally self-interested sociocultural orientations and practices. When self-esteem is set within such a context, attempts to enhance it might prove to be more dogmatic than educational.

References

Adelman, C. (2000). Over two years, what did Froebel say to Pestalozzi? *History of Education, 29*, 103-114.

Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York:

Holt.

Ames, C., & Felkner, D. W. (1979). Effects of self-concept on children's causal attributions and self-reinforcement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 71*, 613-619.

Baumeister, R. F. (1987). How the self became a problem: A psychological review of historical research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 163-176.

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 4*, 1-44.

Branden, N. (1984, August-September). In defense of self. *Association for Humanistic Psychology Newsletter*, 12-13.

Butler, J. (1950). *Fifteen sermons*. New York: Liberal Art Press. (Original work published 1726).

Byrne, B. M., & Shavelson, R. J. (1986). On the structure of adolescent self-concept. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78*, 473-481.

Canfield, J., & Wells, H.C. (1994). *100 ways to enhance self-concept in the classroom*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Craven, R. G., Marsh, H. W., & Burnett, P. (2003). Cracking the self-concept enhancement conundrum: A call and blueprint for the next generation of self-concept enhancement research. In H. W. Marsh, R. G. Craven, & D. M McInerney (Eds.), *International advances in self research* (pp. 91-126). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Cushman, P. (1995). *Constructing the self, constructing America: A cultural history of psychotherapy*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Danziger, K. (1997). *Naming the mind: How psychology found its language*. London, UK: Sage.

Deegan, M. J. (1999). Play from the perspective of George Herbert Mead. In M. J. Deegan (Ed.), *Play, school, and society by George Herbert Mead* (pp. xix-cxii). New York: Peter Lang.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Gillespie, A. (2005). G. H. Mead: Theorist of the social act. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 35*, 19-39.

Greer, S. (2003). Self-esteem and the demoralized self: a genealogy of self research and measurement. In D. B. Hill, & M. J. Kral (Eds.), *About psychology: Essays at the crossroads of history, theory, and philosophy* (pp. 89-108). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Guignon, C. (2004). *On being authentic*. London: Routledge.

Herman, E. (1995). *The romance of American psychology: Political culture in the age of experts*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Jacks, M. L. (1950). *Modern trends in education*. London, UK: Melrose.

Jordan, T. J. (1981). Self-concepts, motivation, and academic achievement of Black adolescents. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 73*, 509-517.

Kohn, A. (1994). The truth about self-esteem. *Phi Delta Kappan*, December, 272-283.

Locke, J. (1995). *An essay concerning human understanding*. Amherst, NY:

Prometheus. (Original work published 1694)
Long, B. H., Henderson, E. H., & Ziller, R. C. (1967). Developmental changes in the self-concept during middle childhood. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 13*, 201-215.
Lyons, J. (1978). *The invention of self: The hinge of consciousness in the eighteenth century*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
Martin, J. (2004). The educational inadequacy of conceptions of self in educational psychology. *Interchange, A Quarterly Review of Education, 35*, 185-208.
Martin, J. (2006). Re-interpreting internalization and agency through G. H. Mead's perspectival realism. *Human Development, 49*, 65-86.
Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
Mayer, F. (1966). *A history of educational thought* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
McDaniel, S., & Bielen, P. (1990). *Project self-esteem*. Austin, TX: Jalmar.
Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, & society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist* (C. Morris, Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Mead, G. H. (1938). *The philosophy of the act* (C. W. Morris, Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Meirieu, P. (2005). *Lettre à un jeune professeur*. Paris: ESF Editeur.
Nicholson, I. A. M. (2003). *Inventing personality: Gordon Allport and the science of selfhood*. Washington, DC: APA Books.
Olson, D. R. (2003). *Psychological theory and educational reform: How school remakes mind and society*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
Piers, E., & Harris, D. B. (1964). Age and other correlates of self-concept in children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 55*, 91-95.
Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21*, 95-103.
Rousseau, J. J. (1979). *Émile or on education* (A. Bloom, Trans.). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published 1762)
Shavelson, R. J. (2003). Preface. In H. Marsh, R. G. Craven, & D. M. McInerney (Eds.), *International advances in self research* (pp. ix-xv). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
Shavelson, R. J., & Bolus, R. (1982). Self-concept: the interplay of theory and models. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*, 3-17.
Soares, A. T., & Soares, L. M. (1969). Self-perceptions of culturally disadvantaged children. *American Educational Research Journal, 6*, 31-45.
Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of modern identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Taylor, C. (1991). *The malaise of modernity*. Concord, On, Canada: Anansi.
Toulmin, S. (1977). Self-knowledge and knowledge of the "self." In T. Mischel (Ed.), *The self: Psychological and philosophical issues* (pp. 291-317). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
Wigfield, A., & Karpathian, M. (1991). Who am I and what can I do? *Educational Psychologist, 26*, 233-261.
Winne, P., and Walsh, J. (1980). Self-concept and participation in school activities reanalyzed. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*, 161-166.

Resisting Bureaucracy:
A Case Study of Home Schooling

Jean A. Patterson
Wichita State University
Ian Gibson
Macquarie University
Andrew Koenigs
Andover Public Schools, Andover, Kansas
Michael Maurer
Haysville Public Schools, Haysville, Kansas
Gladys Ritterhouse
Sterling College
Charles Stockton
Springfield Public Schoools, Springfield, Missouri
& Mary Jo Taylor
Stafford Public Schools, Stafford, Kansas

Home schooling is a growing U.S. trend, with an estimated 1.1 million students being home schooled (Princiotta, Bielick, & Chapman, 2004). The average home school family in the United States is White, middle class, Christian, and conservative (Masters, 1996), yet home school families are becoming increasingly diverse, and now represent a broad cross-section of the nation's racial, ethnic, religious, political, and ideological diversity (Romanowski, 2001; Welner, 2002). Home schooling has sparked passionate and rancorous debates, yet other than general demographics, relatively little is known about the families who choose to educate their children at home (Welner, 2002).

In the spring of 2002, the authors, all of whom are either professors of education or practicing school administrators, were invited to conduct a study of home schooling in a small, rural midwestern town we refer to by the pseudonym of Wheatland. District leaders were interested in learning why families residing in their district chose to home school and what might encourage them to reconsider sending their children

to their local public schools. Prior to embarking upon the study, we expressed misgivings and preconceived notions about home school parents and their motivations for home schooling their children. We could not understand why taxpaying adults did not take advantage of the local public school system, especially one that was small and highly regarded for its academic achievements. We were skeptical about how much time these parents actually spent educating their children. However, our willingness to set aside our own assumptions and listen to the families tell their personal stories resulted in us coming to see them in a different light. The home school families that participated in the study graciously invited us into their homes, their schools, and gave us a glimpse into their lives. They were candid in their assessment of home schooling and public education, and saw the advantages and disadvantages of both.

We first present findings from the qualitative data collected from the home school families. We then use home schooling as a standpoint from which to examine established educational practices that have been the target of criticisms in recent years. A number of reformers have called for the dismantling of schools' bureaucratic structure and culture (Astuto, Clark, Read, McGree, & Fernandez, 1994; Clark & Meloy, 1989; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Larson & Ovando, 2001; Meeks, Meeks, & Warren, 2000; Senge et al., 2000) and replacing them with environments that are inclusive, caring, learning communities more akin to families than factories (Calderwood, 2000; Eaker-Rich & VanGalen, 1996; Furman, 2004; Lipsky & Gartner, 1997; Noddings, 1992; Shields, 2000). We hope that our work will lead to a more balanced and less emotionally charged discussion about why parents elect to home school their children and how the practices of parent educators might inform public education.

The Re-emergence of Home Schooling in the United States

Home schooling has a long history in the United States going back to several centuries, but there is general agreement that the contemporary home school movement began in the 1960s and emerged from two different ideological strands (Basham, 2001; Carper, 2000; Lyman, 1998). One strand came about in response to court rulings that codified the separation of church and state. Conservatives who wanted to raise their children in a traditional Christian environment expressed dissatisfaction with what they saw as the increasing secularization of public schools (Welner, 2002). Because they felt public schools no longer taught the beliefs and values they wanted their children to acquire, they turned to their churches and formed overtly Christian home schools and support groups (Carper, 2000; Somerville, 2001). During the same

timeframe, a second strand was fomenting as a growing number of critics were expressing discontent with the quality of education being provided in public schools. In particular, prescribed curriculum and teacher-centered instruction were identified as contributing to a crisis in public education. In the midst of social upheaval during the 1960s, John Holt's (1964; 1967) "unschooling" ideas were appealing to politically active young families who were challenging the efficacy of all public institutions (Basham, 2001).

In spite of the rapid proliferation of home schooling during the 1960s and 1970s, in 1980 home schooling was still illegal in 30 states and children taught at home were in violation of compulsory attendance laws (Basham, 2001). Due primarily to the efforts of the Home School Legal Defense Association (HSDLA), an advocacy organization created and led by conservative Christian attorneys, by 1993 it was legal in all 50 states to educate a child at home (Somerville, 2001). The HSDLA has remained vigilant in its work to prevent federal or state governmental organizations from interfering with home schools' autonomy. The organization demonstrated its considerable political clout when it pre-empted an effort to require home schools to comply with the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Klicka, 2003; Smith, 2003). Indeed, the No Child Left Behind Desktop Reference published in 2002 by the U.S. Department of Education explicitly states, "Federal control of home schooling is prohibited. Home schools are not subject to NCLB or NCLB assessments" (p. 176). Critics have argued that conservative Christian organizations like HSDLA have appropriated home schooling to serve their own purposes, and the reason they so strongly support home schooling is to further a right wing political agenda that includes the destruction of the U.S. public education system (Berliner, 1997; Lubienski, 2000).

Nonetheless, in a 1998 poll, a majority of Americans agreed that parents have the right to educate their children at home (Lines, 2001). Although home schooling is now legal and most Americans support home schooling as a viable educational alternative, within the ranks of professional educators, home schooling is still seen as a threat to public education (Apple, 2000; Lubienski, 2000; Reich, 2002; Stevens, 2001). Private schools as a form of parental choice do not prompt the type of heated debates that home schooling arouses. What is it about home schooling that raises the hackles of public educators? Basham (2001) concluded that public school administrators and educators should examine how they might be contributing to the loss of students to home schooling, citing inflexible rules and regulations dutifully enforced by professional educators among other attributes typically associated with public education bureaucracies. Therefore, the bureaucratic assumptions that underlie public education provide a useful framework for analysis.

Theoretical Framework: Assumptions about Schooling

Numerous educational researchers have pointed out the bureaucratic assumptions that underpin the way educational organizations are structured and have kept schools from adapting to a rapidly changing society (Astuto et al., 1994; Clark & Meloy, 1989; Darling-Hammond, 1997; Senge et al., 2000; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Bureaucratic assumptions about the structural arrangements of schooling are reflected in time-honored practices such as sorting students into classes according to their chronological age and then further sorting them by perceived ability. Secondary school schedules carve up the day into segments with a single subject taught during each time period. The tacit assumption is that educational decisions should be left to expert school administrators, excluding teachers, parents, and community members from having much voice in how schools should operate (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). According to Darling-Hammond (1997), institutionalizing bureaucratic principles meant "decisions about teaching, curriculum, assessment, and learning passed from the hands of teachers, individually and collectively, to administrators, commercial textbook publishers, and test makers who were not swayed by such distractions as the individual needs of students" (pp. 44-45). Standardization of practices across schools and districts via top-down mandates was viewed as both possible and desirable, and most current organizational structures and educational practices have been in place for over a century (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

Innovators have periodically attempted to introduce new school practices, but familiar institutional practices have proved remarkably resilient (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Public education is not lacking in innovative ideas, but throughout the years implementation of ideas such as total quality management, curriculum integration, teacher collaboration, inclusion, and most recently learning communities, has proven difficult, and many of these trends have come and gone with little to show for them. Such innovations have never proliferated or been sustained over long periods of time. In this analysis, we examine some of the ways that home schools have created alternative organizational arrangements and instructional practices that traditional schools with entrenched bureaucracies have been unable to accomplish.

Study Context and Methodology

The town of Wheatland has a population of approximately 1800 citizens according to 2000 U.S. Census data, and serves as a bedroom community for a nearby metropolitan area. One of nine independent school districts operating in Milo County, Wheatland Public Schools (WPS) is

comprised of three schools: a K-5 elementary school, a 6-8 middle school, and a 9-12 high school, with an enrollment that has remained stable at about 900 students. The town is predominately White and middle class, with only 23% of students considered to be low income as determined by those who qualify for free and reduced price lunches. Students at all three schools perform well academically and most are college-bound.

We identified a total of 15 families in the Wheatland district who were either presently home schooling their children or who had home schooled within the past two years. Each family was invited to participate in an in-depth interview with one of the authors. Five married couples and five individuals (four women and one man) representing 10 home school families agreed to participate in the study, and during spring 2002 we collected data from 15 individuals. Eight of the ten families interviewed had a total of 28 school-aged children. Two of the families were no longer actively home schooling, but had home-schooled their children in the recent past. Each interview was tape recorded and transcribed, and the authors independently read each interview transcript and searched the data for patterns. Data were then inductively analyzed using a constant comparative method, and themes were generated across the set of interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Patton, 2002).

A Glimpse into Home Schools in Wheatland

The 15 home school parents who participated in our study in many ways mirrored the typical demographic of home educators: They were White, middle class, regular churchgoers, and professed Christian values. All 10 of the families lived in modest accommodations; none would be considered financially well off, nor did any of the families characterize themselves as politically active. Although they have benefited from the activism of others, these families were not strident in their views or their criticisms of public education. They were more ideologically moderate than the extremist faces and voices often associated with the conservative strand of the home school movement (Stevens, 2001).

The parents' highest level of formal education covered a broad range. One parent had a 10th grade education and two had high school diplomas. Eight of the 15 parents interviewed had at least two years of post-secondary education at a community college or 4-year public or private institution. Four parents had attained bachelor's degrees, but only one had an education degree and had at one time been a public school teacher. In all but one case, the mother provided the home schooling while the father worked outside the home. However, both parents were actively involved in making curriculum and instructional decisions for their children.

The parent educators who participated in this study did not meet the state's qualifications for teacher certification or licensure and would not be considered "highly qualified" according to NCLB requirements. Most did not even have a college degree. Although they were "lay" teachers, they believed they had succeeded with ensuring their children received a good education. Their children were socially well-adjusted, performed well on standardized achievement and college admission tests (e.g., ACT), and had no difficulty making the transition to work or college. Those whose children eventually entered public school were on par with their peers, and in many cases were ahead of the students in their class.

The parents we interviewed shared a variety of reasons for choosing to home school their children. The most reasons cited most often were a desire to explicitly teach Christian values in the curriculum and the wish to tailor their educational program to best meet each child's learning needs and interests. For this sample of families, home schooling was an opportunity to maintain both a Christian-focused curriculum and a child-centered pedagogy, which is consistent with recent studies that have characterized parents' motivations for home schooling as complex, multi-faceted, and not easily categorized (Collum, 2005; Knowles, 1991). Most parents were not critical of the local schools, but were in fact complimentary; as one parent expressed, "For a public school system, I think Wheatland does a good job." These parents merely wanted their personal decision to home school their children to be respected.

Most of the Wheatland families highly valued education and approached home schooling very seriously. One parent described how his family set up a schoolroom in their mobile home to send a message to their children about the importance of education, "We lived in a mobile home and one of the bedrooms—we had a 3-bedroom place—and one of them was the schoolroom so the kids would know this is serious." His wife concurred, and went on to explain, "We try to be real consistent in our work and expecting that ... they have to be pretty sick in order to miss school."

These parents did not take lightly the decision to home school their children and had no regrets about their choices. They did, however, acknowledge their own limitations and expressed some doubts about their abilities to effectively teach the curriculum. One mother was honest in her self-appraisal that she was fearful of "not being able to cover everything," especially when it came to advanced subjects such as "chemistry and algebra and trig." Another mother admitted home schooling was "a lot more work than I thought it would be." One mother summarized the views of many of the parents we interviewed when she said, "We, as home-schoolers, do have our troubles and frustrations and never feel like we have the bull by the horns. ... We're faced with the same things

in education that the public schools are." These parents were candid in their admission that teaching required a lot of hard work and dedication, and they too experienced failed lesson plans and were sometimes confronted with students who were unmotivated and uncooperative.

Home school parents who failed to rigorously educate their children were especially troubling to the parents we interviewed. One mother stated frankly, "There are bad apples out there that are home schooling." A father explained his concern, "We can tell you families that don't stay on track. A year went by and they would only have nine weeks worth of work done. You can't do that. We do not want to fail our kids by doing that." These parents recognized that the poor educational practices of a few home educators reflected badly on those who were committed to upholding high academic standards.

Most of the parents interviewed were well aware of the public scrutiny they were under and worked hard to ensure that home schooling was seen in a positive light. One parent stated, "It matters to us what people think and how they view home schooling. We want to give an honest picture and yet a good one." In spite of their concerns, these home school parents were resolute in their belief that they had made the right decision to home school their children and were able to meet their children's educational needs in ways that public schools were not.

Overcoming Bureaucratic Barriers

Bureaucratic schools are non-adaptable structures; they are not able to respond to the unique needs and interests of individuals. In other words, students must accept what the school is able to provide, as public schools with large numbers of students must batch process them through a regimented curriculum (Astuto et al., 1994). Several parents indicated that when they first started home schooling they attempted to emulate public school structures and schedules so their home would seem more like a traditional school. One family described how they used bells to signal class periods and recess. Most families, however, quickly abandoned the idea of establishing traditional school structures in their homes, finding them to be more constraining of their efforts than helpful. Instead, they created flexible and responsive educational environments, both within their own homes and in collaboration with other families. They organized and structured the school day and made choices regarding curriculum and instructional strategies they believed were in their children's best interests. In the next section, we examine the practice of home school parents that run against the grain of bureaucratic assumptions of schooling. These included dynamic and fluid networks, flexible

structures and schedules, responsive pedagogy, tailored curriculum and materials, small classes, and multiage groupings.

Networks of Families

Educational networks have been proposed as a reform explicitly designed to counter bureaucratic school arrangements (Lieberman, 2000; Lieberman & Grolnick, 1996; Pennell & Firestone, 1996). Networks encourage teachers to collaborate and communicate within and across schools, to share resources, and to maximize the use of new technologies. Lieberman characterized the educational networks she studied as "flexible, borderless, and innovative" (p. 221). She might have been describing these home school families, who were not the socially isolated people they are often portrayed (Arai, 1999). The families in our study were loosely organized, but highly interconnected, as they collaborated with like-minded families to share responsibility for educational and recreational activities.

Through their churches or local home school associations, these parent educators found other families with whom to exchange areas of expertise and to provide opportunities for group activities. Describing a home school cooperative in a neighboring town, a parent told us about the many activities parent educators with particular talents and/or expertise shared with other families. She enthused, "We've done gym, music class, piano lessons, guitar lessons, basketball, thousands of field trips." Within this loose coalition of participants, home school families have maintained some of the longstanding traditions and rituals associated with school, such as sports competitions, band and orchestra, and high school graduation ceremonies. The home school support groups were quite fluid, and coalitions of families continuously ebbed and flowed. Families would come together for specific activities and then move on to join other groups as their children's interests and needs changed.

Home educators also participated in more formal activities and associations both locally and nationally. All but one of the parents regularly attended the home school conference held annually in the nearby city. The conference provides an array of curriculum and instructional materials and offers seminars and workshops designed to help home educators improve their instructional skills. The expansion of home schooling has contributed to the growth of an entire industry devoted to meeting the needs of home educators, which has given them a multitude of resources at their fingertips. The Wheatland families we interviewed all took advantage of the myriad options available to them, as they made informed decisions about curriculum, educational materials, and support services.

Curriculum, Educational Materials, and Support Services

Publishers of textbooks and large-scale assessments have benefited from the trend toward increasing state and national control over educational decisions, which has resulted in a narrowing of options for curriculum, textbooks, and assessments (Spring, 2005). Rather than having decisions about curriculum, books, and other materials foisted upon them by policymakers, educational bureaucrats, or textbook publishers, home school parents have access to a vast array of choices. Several parents mentioned they conducted extensive research in order to find the curriculum that best met their children's educational needs. One parent explained that each of his children "had different curriculum" and that he and his wife "had to go and research for each kid." The explosion of videoconferencing, computer technology, the Internet, and virtual schools has facilitated teaching, especially subjects beyond the parents' knowledge and expertise. A parent explained how his children participated in distance education courses: "Our students sit in front of the TV like they are right in the classroom with the teacher talking to them like they are in the video class."

Families also used the services of businesses that specialized in providing home schools with curriculum, transcripts, grades, and diplomas. One parent described the curriculum she used as an "easy to teach method...because it's developed mainly for home school parents. ... You know what tests to take, what to do, and it's just easy to follow." Parents also employed the services of companies that catered to home and private Christian schools. In addition to providing curriculum and materials, these vendors maintain testing records and transcripts, and issue high school diplomas. A parent enumerated what the company he contracted with offered: "They take care of achievement testing, they take care of grading tests, they keep our transcripts, they keep our report cards; they keep all that kind of thing."

Flexible Structures and Schedules

Home school parents worked to maintain a balance between providing their children with routine and structure while simultaneously allowing their daily schedules to be flexible and adaptive. They did not compartmentalize their lives into school and home; they did not separate learning academic subjects from their daily lives, as one mother phrased it, "Home education is more of a lifestyle than set apart time." Another mother explained, "It's hard to separate school and home. It's our way of life. ... They're not in school just three or four hours a day.

They are learning all the time." As the comment illustrates, many of the parents articulated a fairly sophisticated philosophy of learning as "our way of life," something that was happening "all the time," and not just within the confines of a classroom or a fixed number of hours that constitute a school day.

Because these parent educators recognized that education extended well beyond the boundaries of a classroom, they adjusted their schedules to take advantage of learning opportunities as they arose. One parent explained, "Just to give you an example, we are planning a missions trip through our church this spring in April and because of our home school we can take our kids with us. We will spend a little over a week in Chihuahua, Mexico." Overnight field trips and opportunities to participate in church-sponsored mission work would not be possible within a traditional public school calendar and would likely not even be seen as educational.

Home schooling occurred year round for most families, and they structured academics around seasonal activities. For instance, in one home spring and summer gardening was used to teach a variety of science concepts. Because their children were involved in educational activities all year long, parent educators did not feel constrained by a 6-hour school day. One mother explained:

> Since we do it all year round, I don't say that we have to do 6 hours a day. We can kind of work around our schedule. Plus, they retain a lot more when we don't quit for 3 months. We haven't always done that. We just found out that it's the better way. They're usually interested in something in the summertime, so we ended up doing [school] anyway.

Most home school families followed a daily routine, yet it did not necessarily conform to the pattern of a typical school day where all students move through the same activities at the same time. Instead, home schooling allowed the children to pace themselves. With the low student-teacher ratio, students could be given tasks, work alone, and the parent educator could help as needed.

Responsive Pedagogy

As was evident in the previous section, most parents expressed a child-centered pedagogical philosophy. They had learned through their experiences that allowing children to pursue their interests made teaching easier and learning more enjoyable. These parents saw firsthand how their children bored easily and lost interest in a basic academic curriculum taught using traditional instructional practices. They recognized that tailoring curriculum and instructional strategies to children's interests fostered success and capitalized on their intrinsic motivation.

As one parent put it, "We let them excel in what they are interested in. And we don't have to push them." She went on to say, "They do so much more when it's their idea." Another parent shared that her approach to planning lessons entailed, "Whatever project the kids want to do." Home school families discovered on their own, as one mother put it, "if they're interested in it, boy, they're going to learn it and know it well."

These home school parents desired for their children to pursue their own interests, yet they also expressed that children should have structure and discipline in their lives. This belief was evident in their approach to schoolwork. One parent remarked, "We wanted to teach them discipline - we had a set schedule." Another said, "They have to have their homework done before they can do certain things." Self-governance and self-discipline were also important to these parent educators, as one said, "They are on their own to complete their work." Another mother referred to her child's school day as "self-directed."

Multiage Groupings within and Across Families

Most formal schools organize themselves into grades with students of the same age comprising each grade following the logic of hierarchy and division of labor to increase efficiency of production (Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Small schools with not enough students to form separate grades have demonstrated the educational and social benefits of multiage grouping (Veenman, 1996). Likewise, this group of parent educators felt their children were advantaged by the multiage groupings that were naturally created within their own families and across families involved in their networks. One parent explained that his children benefited from relationships that spanned age ranges and even generations: "They have friendships from very old to very young and make the movement between the age groups very easily." Activities and field trips with other families that created larger multiage groups were also seen as advantageous. One parent explained, "You have an age variety; therefore you don't have all 25 of one age. You have first graders with eighth graders." Her husband elaborated, "Big brother is there to take care of little brother, like that." Older students and siblings were responsible for younger ones, breaking down the barriers that often exist between ages, grades, and school buildings.

In summary, the home school families who participated in this study were structured, yet flexible in their approaches to use of time, curriculum, instructional strategies, and groupings. They saw learning as an ongoing, dynamic process that did not occur only when students were completing assignments. They articulated and enacted a child-centered

pedagogical philosophy and tailored lessons and learning activities to maximize multiple ages and family networks. They had access to advanced technology and resources that assisted with teaching as well as the necessary record keeping and paper trail. They have been able to accomplish what most public schools would like to do, but are unable to because of prescribed curriculum, inflexible schedules and structures, and increased pressures to perform well on standardized tests.

Implications for Public Education: Envisioning Alternatives

The contemporary home school movement has prompted a polarizing debate over the merits of home school versus the merits of more traditional places called schools. We do not wish to "take sides" in what we believe is an unproductive argument. Although we acknowledge our study included a small number of home school families, we do believe public education can gain from their insights and home grown educational practices. We agree with Belfield (2004) who observed,

> Potentially, home schooling could revolutionize education in the U.S.: instead of regimented, standardized provision delivered within a detailed set of rules and regulations, learning could be much more diverse, open, and flexibly tailored to a child's requirements and responsive to his or her individual development. (p. 18)

Some home school researchers have previously suggested that the growth of the home schooling movement serves as a critique of the formal, institutionalized, and impersonal bureaucracies that characterize most public schools (Bauman, 2005; Belfield, 2004; Hill, 2000; Marshall & Valle, 1996). It is perhaps not surprising that the parent educators in this study either intuitively understood or figured out that traditional school structures were not effective in their home schools. They did not allow themselves to be constrained by the cultural practices associated with outmoded but resilient school practices, as they had the insight and power to make adjustments to the school day, curriculum, and instructional strategies. These parent educators took advantage of multiage groupings and they collaborated with other home school families. Their vast network of resources was impressive. These home educators were committed to improving their teaching practices, but also knew their limitations and found ways to overcome them. Paperwork and many other bureaucratic requirements were outsourced to organizations whose primary function was to keep records and manage information. Doing so gave parents more time to focus on curriculum and instruction.

These parent educators understood that teaching was hard work, but were also motivated and committed to becoming better teachers. They

did not claim to have all the answers, and spent time attending conferences and researching curriculum, materials, and instructional strategies. They found a balance between structure and flexibility; they built lesson plans around children's interests. They sought outside assistance when confronted with subject matter that was beyond their capabilities. Once they abandoned the familiar but unworkable bureaucratic school structure, they created educational environments that fostered learning. They were also critical of home educators they felt were not doing a very good job of teaching. The home educators who participated in this study may have been unusual, but in many ways they exemplify the characteristics of any effective teacher and effective school.

The day-to-day realities, experiences and perspectives of this group of home educators seem at odds with the agendas of conservative political organizations like HSLDA. Ironically, HSLDA leaders who claim to speak for home schools have silenced and marginalized home school families who are not in a position to be heard. Many in the public education arena have vilified the home school movement. It seems that home school families are neither the pawns of the political right, nor do they deserve to be demonized by public education researchers, policymakers, administrators, or teachers. As we gain a deeper understanding about the people behind the demographics of home schooling, a picture emerges of families who want what is best for their children; who desire to be involved with their children's lives and education.

References

Apple, M. W. (2000). The cultural politics of home schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75*(1 & 2), 256-271.

Arai, A. B. (1999, September 6). Homeschooling and the redefinition of citizenship. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 7*(27). Retrieved March 5, 2002, from http://epaa.asu.edu/v7n27.html

Astuto, T. A., Clark, D. L., Read, A.-M., McGree, K., & Fernandez, L. d. P. (1994). *Roots of reform: Challenging the assumptions that control change in education*. Indianapolis, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Basham, P. (2001). *Homeschooling: From the extreme to mainstream*. Vancouver, BC, Canada: The Fraser Institute.

Bauman, K. J. (2005, February 16). One million home schooled students. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved August 2, 2005, from http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentID=11756

Belfield, C. R. (2004). *Home-schooling in the U.S.* (Occasional Paper No. 88). New York: National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Berliner, D. C. (1997). Educational psychology meets the Christian right: Differing views of children, schooling, teaching, and learning. *Teachers College*

Record, 98(3), 381-416.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Calderwood, P. (2000). *Learning community: Finding common ground in difference*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Carper, J. C. (2000). Pluralism to establishment to dissent: The religious and educational context of home schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75*(1 & 2), 8-19.

Clark, D. L., & Meloy, J. M. (1989). Renouncing bureaucracy: A democratic structure for leadership in schools. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. H. Moore (Eds.), *Schooling for tomorrow* (pp. 272-294). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Collum, E. (2005). The ins and outs of homeschooling: The determinants of parental motivations and student achievement. *Education and Urban Society, 37*(3), 307-335.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eaker-Rich, D., & VanGalen, J. A. (Eds.). (1996). *Caring in an unjust world: Negotiating borders and barriers in schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Furman, G. C. (2004). The ethic of community. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(2), 215-235.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Hill, P. T. (2000). Home schooling and the future of public education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75*(1&2), 20-31.

Holt, J. (1964). *How children fail*. New York: Pitman.

Holt, J. (1967). *How children learn*. New York: Pitman.

Klicka, C. (2003, October 23). *The myth of teacher qualifications.* Home School Legal Defense Association. Retrieved July 31, 2005, from http://www.hslda.org/docs/nche/000002/00000214.asp

Knowles, J. G. (1991). Parents' rationales for operating home schools. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 20*(2), 203-230.

Larson, C. L., & Ovando, C. J. (2001). *The color of bureaucracy: The politics of equity in multicultural school communities*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lieberman, A. (2000). Networks as learning communities: Shaping the future of teacher development. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 221-227.

Lieberman, A., & Grolnick, M. (1996). Networks and reform in American education. *Teachers College Record, 98*(1), 7-45.

Lines, P. M. (2001). *Homeschooling.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon. Retrieved 2002, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/archives/homesch.html

Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1997). *Inclusion and school reform: Transforming America's classrooms*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Lubienski, C. (2000). Whither the common good? A critique of home schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75*(1&2), 207-232.

Lyman, I. (1998). Homeschooling: Back to the future. *Policy Analysis, 294*, 1-22.

Marshall, J. D., & Valle, J. P. (1996, August 8). Public school reform: Potential lessons from the truly departed. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 4 (12).* Retrieved March 5, 2002, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v4n12.html

Masters, D. G. (1996). *Public library services for home schooling*. Syracuse, NY: Center for Science and Technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. 402936)

Meeks, L. F., Meeks, W. A., & Warren, C. A. (2000). Racial desegregation: Magnet schools, vouchers, privatization, and home schooling. *Education and Urban Society, 33*(1), 88-101.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pennell, J. F., & Firestone, W. A. (1996). Changing classroom practices through teacher networks: Matching program features with teacher characteristics and circumstances. *Teachers College Record, 98*(1), 46-76.

Princiotta, D., Bielick, S., & Chapman, C. (2004). *1.1 million homeschooled students in the United States in 2003* (No. NCES 2004115). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Reich, R. (2002). The civic perils of homeschooling. *Educational Leadership, 59*(7), 56-59.

Romanowski, M. H. (2001). Common arguments about the strengths and limitations of home schooling [Electronic version]. *Clearing House, 75* (2), 79-83. Retrieved January 24, 2002 from http://proxy.wichita.edu:2063

Senge, P. M., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., & Kleiner, A. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. New York: Doubleday.

Shields, C. M. (2000). Learning from difference: Consideration for schools as communities. *Curriculum Inquiry, 30*(3), 275-294.

Smith, J. M. (2003, March/April). No child left untested? *The Home School Court Report, 19 (2).* Retrieved July 31, 2005, from http://www.hslda.org/courtreport/v19n2/v19n209.asp

Somerville, S. W. (2001). *The politics of survival: Home schoolers and the law.* Home School Legal Defense Fund Association. Retrieved October 22, 2001, from http://www.hslda.org

Spring, J. (2005). *Conflict of interests: The politics of American education* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stevens, M. L. (2001). *Kingdom of children: Culture and controversy in the homeschooling movement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Department of Education Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2002). *No child left behind: A desktop reference*. Washington, DC: Author.

Veenman, S. (1996). Cognitive and noncognitive effects of multigrade and multiage classes: A best-evidence synthesis [Electronic version]. *Review of Edu-*

cational Research, 66 (3), Retrieved September 19, 2002 from http://proxy.wichita.edu:2-63/WebZ/FTFETCH

Welner, K. M. (2002). *Understudied education: Toward building a homeschool research agenda* (Occasional Paper No. 48). New York: National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Walter Kaufmann and the Future of the Humanities

David Pickus
Arizona State University

...And woe unto all the living that it would live without disputes over weight and scales and weighers! —Nietzsche, *Zarathustra*, II, 13

Introduction: What's at Stake in Discussing the Future of the Humanities

The start of 21st century may very well be the final era in which the humanities enjoy substantial autonomy and prestige. Advances in genetics, evolutionary and biological psychology, combined with the increasing sophistication of statistical models of behavior prediction, may make current justifications for the study of the humanities sound quaint at best, and obscurantist at worse. To be sure, the end of the humanities has been predicted before, and its decline or demise may never happen.[1] this essay is not written in the hope that it will happen, only with the awareness that, as Walter Kaufmann put it, "the refusal to reflect on goals invites disaster."[2] In this respect, the following pages will consider the prospects for the humanities without two implicit, and wishfully sentimental, assumptions, namely that, without the humanities, something irreplaceably precious will be lost, or that, once we move beyond the humanities, what follows would inevitably be better. The fact is that we simply don't know how educational practices will look from the standpoint of future generations.[3] Rather; our task should be to identify what is most valuable in the humanities, asking whether our current practices in fact achieve our goals.

Hence, this essay seeks aid in the discussion of aims and means by turning to Walter Kaufmann who, a generation ago, had some interesting ideas about what was at stake in the study of the humanities. I will present some of Kaufmann's main views on this subject, highlighting the ongoing relevance of his sharp critique of contemporary education. Specifically, I will focus on his mostly forgotten 1977 volume, *The Future of the Humanities,* arguing that it is not only worth reading today, but may help the humanities maintain their viability altogether. To reach this end, I will place Kaufmann in his historical context, providing an exposition of his main pedagogical ideas, focusing especially on what he called "the art of reading."[4] Once a picture of Kaufmann's main contribution has emerged, I will finish the piece by linking Kaufmann to a well-publicized concern in pedagogy, namely Gerald Graff's efforts to integrate students into academic "argument culture" by "teaching the conflicts."[5] This sets the stage for an overarching conclusion, where I argue that, while Kaufmann certainly does not allay all anxieties about the future of the humanities, his ideas about education (primarily, though not exclusively, college education) prepare us well to face a critical and neglected aspect of the problem: our own uncertainties and sense of doubt as to whether we instructors can convey something of value in the humanities altogether.

Who Was Walter Kaufmann and Why Should Pedagogy Care?

Walter Kaufmann (1921-1980) was a prolific and incisive writer who deserves much more attention than he has yet received. Spending his career as professor of philosophy at Princeton, Kaufmann's specialty was German philosophy and through that he is not entirely unknown today. For the most part, "academic public opinion" tends to remember him as a transmitter and popularizer, more than a thinker in his own right. This incorrect assumption tends to impede a full appreciation of Kaufmann's work. To be sure, Kaufmann played a significant role in bringing central European thought to the United States. He was one of the first to produce reliable translations of Nietzsche to a broad American public. His 1954, *The Portable Nietzsche*, included *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, and by the end of his career, Kaufmann had provided accurate and readable translations of eleven of Nietzsche's major works.[6] These, along with Kaufmann's own 1950 monograph (revised and expanded in 1956, 1968 and 1974) *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* gave Nietzsche a prominent place in American academia, one that he never held before, and has never lost since.[7] This work alone would have earned Kaufmann a solid place in American intellectual history, but for Kaufmann it was only one project among many. Many more of

his translations and anthologies changed and deepened America's appreciation for European thought. Special mention should be made of his 1956 volume, *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*.[8] Still in print today, for three generations of college students it has remained one of *the* sources of existentialist literature.

Yet making the works of others accessible was only a portion of Kaufmann's contribution to the humanities. He was a philosopher in his own right, writing several interesting and idiosyncratic works in the philosophy of religion, ethics, and aesthetics. Notable among them are the *Critique of Religion and Philosophy* (1958) and *The Faith of a Heretic* (1960).[9] The main thrust of these books has not been dated, as they provide critical exploration of the nature and limitations of religion by someone familiar with religion's history, as well as the psychological, aesthetic and philosophical dimensions of the subject. Obviously, to cover all of Kaufmann's efforts would require a volume of its own. However, his credentials as a humanist can be set forth: the very titles of some his works like *Tragedy and Philosophy* (1968) or *Religions in Four Dimensions* (1974) show that Kaufmann understood his task to be interdisciplinary, attentive to questions of philology and translation and historical in scope.[10] When it came time to reflect directly on education his thoughts grew out of his own practice. *The Future of the Humanities* contains the ideas of a writer who spent his life not simply theorizing about, but pursuing the humanities.

Exile and Belonging

It is not enough to know that Kaufmann, by his own standards, was a humanist; to comprehend his concerns fully, we should know something about how he became one. Thus, a biographical point about Kaufmann helps in this context. As maverick as he was, he did fit into an important sociological group. Kaufmann was a German-Jewish refugee, who escaped to America as a teenager in 1939. The memory of the persecution he saw and experienced colored his approach to writing and lent it an air of existential urgency. In a world where so many did not survive, or were forced to live without their freedom, Kaufmann would make his engagement with the humanities matter. All this is essential background for understanding Kaufmann's case, since his thoughts on education arose directly from his experience in both the old and new worlds. Like other Jewish émigré scholars—Hannah Arendt, Leo Strauss, and Karl Popper come to mind—Kaufmann was preoccupied with the concern that civilization not succumb to the forces of organized irrationality.[11] He belonged to a cohort that was educated in the highest

traditions of European civilization, but which witnessed the triumph of "neo-barbarism."

Yet, even here Kaufmann did not quite fit in with the other. Although he enjoyed a rigorous *Gymnasium* education, complete with classical languages, he was younger than other refugee scholars. Hence, the Germany he came to know was one seen through the eyes of a teenager belonging to a shunned and persecuted minority. Kaufmann never felt the nostalgia for Europe or the German patriotism common in the older generation. Indeed, unlike them, his education was as much American as it was European. Arriving alone in America at age seventeen, Kaufmann was able to attend Williams College, where by dint of hard work he received his B.A. in 1941. His graduate studies in philosophy were interrupted by the Second World War. After being discharged from the service, his doctorate was granted in 1947. In a sense, Kaufmann saw some of the best of old and new world education. It is this atypical background that sets the stage for his wider reflections.

Philosophy as Subversion

Is there a dominant theme in Kaufmann's work? Answering this question can begin to help us understand what he expected from the humanities, as well as from education in the humanities. Although Kaufmann never associated himself with a particular school or specific cause, his writings continually emphasize the transformative and unsettling potential of thought. Perhaps this dissatisfaction with things as they are is why, though Kaufmann never fully caught on with academic philosophers, he maintains a degree of popularity among undergraduates and a wider reading public.[12] Kaufmann himself seems to have relished this outsider status. His works were sharply critical of what he considered to be a strain of escapism in the professional philosophy of his day. What appealed to him in philosophy was—to adapt Alcibiades' words in the *Symposium*—its Socratic capacity to make one ashamed of the life he or she is living.[13] This does not require the philosopher to be completely right, as much as it demands they identify errors and prod others to reach higher. As Kaufmann put it in a 1958 work, long before the notion of "subversion" was fashionable, "philosophy subverts man's satisfaction with himself, exposes custom as a questionable dream, and offers not so much solutions as a different life."[14] When he turned to pedagogy, therefore, it was not to restore the validity of an enduring canon, nor was it to advocate a new turn, in the direction of relevance. Rather, it was to confront an enduring problem, one made more pressing by the increasing prominence of the sciences. This problem can be defined as one of "blindness." As he put it:

> Blindness can be taught and has been for centuries. A great deal of education has always been indoctrination. Students were taught what to see and exhorted not to see inconvenient facts, alternatives, or even their own beliefs. Piety consisted in staying inside, in the dark, believing what you were told. To see for yourself or go outside to find out how your beliefs looked when you stepped back far enough was impiety.[15]

Thus, when he claimed that that, "the sad condition of the humanities should be a matter of vital concern for all of us," he meant that the obvious blindness of previous ages was not really overcome. It was simply replaced with less visible "pieties."[16] He is hardly alone in seeing conformity in academia,[17] so to understand him further we should ask what, specifically, his version of the problem?

Reading as Key

Put most directly, the problem is that teachers of the humanities fail to read well, and are passing this failure on to their students.[18] Kaufmann thought the humanities were only justified to the extent that they cultivated what can be called "the authenticity of reading." What this meant was that, "we must allow ourselves to be addressed by a text; we must hearken for its distinctive voice; we must try to discern how it differs from all other voices. We must permit it to challenge shock and offend us."[19] However, in the practices he saw around him, he charged that, "*one reads without encountering a You and takes no chances of suffering culture shock*." The problem was that, "though written by men and women, *the texts are dehumanized and read in a parochial spirit*."[20] Even very sophisticated methodological approaches can deflect attention away from a text's individual challenge.[21]

To clarify what he meant Kaufmann identified three strategies of evasion. They are "exegetical," "dogmatic," and "agnostic" reading, and he felt they were common in humanities courses, past as well as present. All are variant ways of not thinking about a text's central problems and the challenges they pose to our view of things. "Exegetes," for Kaufmann, "first endowed the text with authority, then read their own ideas into it, and then got them back endowed with authority."[22] If the message of the Gospel of St. John is "determined" to be completely compatible with, say, Marxism or existentialism, and then declared to be true because it is the Bible, we are reading exegetically. This shades into dogmatic reading, whereby readers take the stance, "we know and he doesn't."[23] If the books of Islamic *Hadith* or Jewish *Midrash* are measured by the standards of Christian theological dogma and then found to be lacking, then, for Kaufmann, this is reading dogmatically. As he put charged,

"the dogmatic reader avoids self-exposure, blinds himself to alternatives and objections, and refuses to see what is distinctive in the text and could not just as well be found at home."[24] Finally, there is agnostic approach, which revolves around "suspending judgment" about the truth. For Kaufmann, it can take on a myriad of forms, but always involves not thinking about the text's primary messages. The variant that he found most prevalent in his own day was the "microscopic," meaning that "one no longer has breath enough to read a book several times to get a whole view, not to speak of an author's oeuvre. One prefers to study one poem, one passage or one argument. In this way the author is spirited away, the encounter with a challenging You is avoided, and one deals with small pieces that can be taken apart."[25] If these strategies of evasion are followed, blindness, rather than insight, is taught.

Missing the Obvious

At this point, a reader may wish to raise two objections. First, a great deal of the past generation's "theory" has disputed the notion that one can approach a text in an unmediated fashion.[26] Therefore, isn't there something naïve about Kaufmann's contention that students can access the distinctive "You" in any given text. Second, isn't what Kaufmann has to say obvious? After all, who consciously argues for parochialism in the reading and teaching of texts? Kaufmann, therefore, will never convince those he is most trying to reach.

These two objections, placed together, are somewhat contradictory. However, they add up to a consistent enough claim that what Kaufmann said is familiar, and hasn't the force to challenge current ways of doing things. In such a case, it is pointless to respond to these objections with the contradictory assertion that Kaufmann is, indeed, relevant. That will only convince those already on Kaufmann's side. Rather, the best approach is to practice a bit of what he preached and to spend a bit of time uncovering Kaufmann's own, distinctive presence.

Here, consider again his situation in 1939. As precocious as Kaufmann may have been we he landed in the U.S., attending college, by American standards, was the natural choice him. However, at that time, Kaufmann thought in European terms, and believed that his natural path was to proceed straight on to specialized study of philosophy. As he understood it, the American system was only putting another obstacle in his way. As he described his thought process at the time, "Having graduated from a German secondary school, I could have entered a (German, D.P.) university and obtained a doctorate in three years, had it not been for Hitler."[27] But as it turned out, his time at Williams was not only helpful

to him, but marked out his own ideas of what education should be. He said that, "in a way a good liberal arts college is an isle of the blessed in a cruel world," going on to add:

> I can think of no better way of showing this then to recall my own experience of coming to such a college in 1939. I had left Nazi Germany, crossed the Atlantic in a hurricane, and suddenly found myself in an altogether different world. In ever so many tangible ways, I encountered freedom. The students could pursue their intellectual interests and the professors could do the same. It would have been boorish to ask about the purpose of all of this; it was so beautiful.[28]

Nevertheless, what is beautiful may not be up to the challenges the world presents. Kaufmann noted that on the eve of America's entry into World War Two, in which a number of his fellow students were to die, Williams College, "might almost as well have been on the moon,"[29] so distant did it seem from the catastrophes unfolding in Europe and Asia. Exacerbating this tendency, and making it more harmful, was an ongoing spiritual insularity:

> It was in those days that it was considered admirable for a teacher to be Socratic...But it was difficult to find professors who ran any risk of ever being accused of impiety, as Socrates was. One was genteel and did not think of questioning the faith and morals of one's society—at least not in one's own way, without the support of any rival creed or ideology, like Socrates.[30]

Thus, while Kaufmann did indeed see great potential in American education, he also saw it as potential unfulfilled. It was this experience, filtered through his tremendous energy and prodigious learning that ultimately culminated in *The Future of the Humanities.*

But it was not only this experience. America's victory, The Cold War, and all its attendant social transformations forever changed the American university, moving away from what Kaufmann called "the age of teacups" to the "age of specialization."[31] In this era—one that is still with us—research, expansion of capacities and technique and professionalization dominate individual and collective agendas. Kaufmann was not utterly opposed to specialization (the same way he was not utterly opposed to the sheltered freedom of the old-fashioned liberal arts college). Yet, as he saw it, "some realize that specialization is an indispensable propaedeutic. Others go on to specialize more and more to become great experts on something so small and often trivial that nobody except a few other pedants in the same boat would ever like to hear about it. That is the direction in which the humanities have moved since the 1950s and they did not start from scratch even then."[32]

Exacerbating matters was the fact that Kaufmann felt students were arriving at universities without the mastery of basic skills that would enable them to focus on their studies, making disciplined progress from there. Thus, at the worst, a small circle tends to cultivate the humanities in an overly narrow fashion, while the majority dabbles in the humanities without any though understanding of how to advance.[33] For different reasons, members of each group are unlikely to be reached by the material to which they are exposed. What mattered most to him was that the expanded, ever more market driven, pursuit of the humanities on American campuses not squander its opportunities to provoke Socratic questioning and critical self-reflection.[34] Making use of these opportunities was essential to Kaufmann's own "distinctive You." After all, he saw himself what happened when these Socratic opportunities were not taken.

To Teach the Students

Of course, leaning more about Kaufmann's sensibilities does not directly settle the concerns raised earlier. W e must still ask what distinguishes Kaufmann's suggestions from other critiques (and complaints) about the state of the humanities. Here, we can turn to a specific proposal Kaufmann made for a course in comparative religion. As Kaufmann's friend, Saul Goldwasser, rightly pointed out, for Kaufmann, "religious texts provide the perfect subject matter for Socratic scrutiny, and dialectical reading."[35] Kaufmann made this point by noting that, "it is in religion that faith and morals are encountered par excellence, and in different religions, if not different sects and phases of the same ones, we find radically divergent faiths and moral views."[36] His proposed one-term course would cover parts of the Old and New Testaments, the Koran, The Dhammapada, The Bhagavad-Gita, the Confucian Analects and the Tao-Teh-Ching.[37] The most important consequence of the course would be that students see that these works do not necessarily say what they think religion teaches, and that compared to each other, all outline distinctive ways of life, ones that spark an existential awareness of human choices and limitations.

Thus, Kaufmann's view should not be equated with the conservative notion that there is a set canon of unchanging classics and enduring verities. Rather, each text has its own history, and students should grasp something of the conflict-laden manner in which it took shape and developed. By the same token, seeing texts historically does not entail reading one's own ideas into a work, or substituting more amenable texts for those that have been, historically, most challenging and influential. Kaufmann charged that, "more and more students graduate from college having read a lot of recent articles and books that are but a short

while later as dated and forgotten as of most of last year's headlines. Meanwhile, even art historians rarely know the Bible."[38]

What, specifically, made Kaufmann's proposed course better? Two advantages can be singled out. First, they would treat religious texts in an interdisciplinary fashion. In Kaufmann's understanding, those within a disciplinary specialty should take the trouble to explain clearly to those outside it why they thought one way, rather than another. Such efforts are central because "they force us to step back sufficiently to see the context of our specialty and become aware of our assumptions."[39] In an undergraduate class, the instructor may have to "play all the disciplines," but the students should acquire some sense of what it does and does not mean to look at a text in different ways. Second, his course encouraged students to think about translation, broadly defined. Kaufmann did not simply suggest that "The Bible" be assigned to students. He wanted those unable to read it in the original to, at least, compare various translations, and think about meanings and perspectives that might be lost. This was not a minor concern for him. He devoted a section of *The Future of the Humanities* to discussing translation and its problems. A comment he made on the failure to take notice of these matters reveals something of his overall pedagogical goals. The smaller issue under discussion was the fact that Freud is often read exclusively in what is called "The Standard Translation." Kaufmann used this to make a larger point:

> Freud was one of the greatest writers of our century, and he is extremely difficult to translate. Anyone who tries to translate no more than the quotations he needs in a scholarly discussion of Freud quickly finds how much is lost in the process. Moreover, Freud, more than anyone with the possible exception of Nietzsche, has taught us to attend to nuances, and it is odd that people writing seriously about him should feel no need whatsoever to do so.[40]

In the classroom, the goal would be to guard against such parochialism by making the difficulties of translation an ongoing spur to candor and self-reflection. Indeed, consideration of the hazards of translation is an initial step in a path of discovery. By this method, students truly would be exposed to alternative world views. Hence, they would be forced to decide what speaks for and against them.

Quest for Engagement

But doesn't every teacher of the humanities try to do all this anyway? This is a difficult issue because if one speaks in generalities there is a tendency to amalgamate Kaufmann's concerns to a generalized quest for "engagement" that is very common in the literature on the humanities

and its pedagogy.[41] Hence; I want to provide a brief comparison between Kaufmann's approach and other, popular, ideas. First, it is worth noting that Kaufmann's ideas cut across ideological divides. Take, for instance, a debate on "active learning" or a "student centered classroom." By Kaufmann's standards this could cut either way. Students given informal or community building exercises may engage the spirit of a text more closely, and then again, they may not. The important issue is the discovery of the particular challenge of the text. We should not lose sight of this goal.

This leads to a second point, one where we can introduce Gerald Graff. He has argued that have argued that humanities instructors should "teach the conflicts," which in practice means that they should be introduced to secondary, critical literature, and then clarifying to students what is at stake in this academic conversation. While I share a number of Graff's concerns, from a Kaufmann-ian standpoint, it is worth asking whether there truly is an academic conversation, or only a series of time-bound and sectarian controversies. After all, reading and discussing six scholarly articles on St. Thomas Aquinas may help students form their own ideas about him, but then again it may not. Suppose four of those articles accepted all of St. Thomas' presuppositions unquestioningly, while a fifth denounced him for being a tool of feudal landlords, and the six is not really interested in anything except the ways some ideas from the *Summa Theologica* can be taken from their original context and used to endorse the ideas of a much different philosopher who lived hundreds of years later. To be sure, even if Graff will not use a term like "spirit of the text," he does want the scholarly criticism that students read to direct attention to uncovering the text's possible meanings.

But what are students then to do after they use secondary sources to uncover possible meanings? In *Beyond the Culture Wars*, Graff approached this issue in a sidelong fashion by maintaining that since "there is, alas, no trouble free zone of reading,"[42] we might as well avoid turning our classes into "non-communicating monologues" and teach the intellectual controversies about what this meaning is. If students were taught these intellectual conflicts over a poem like "Dover Beach," then, according to Graff, "they might also find it easier to make out the sense of the poem, for the controversy over it might give them the sort of context for reading it that they probably lack." Yet, immediately after saying this, Graff attaches a significant condition, namely that:

> The controversy would have to be presented in a way that avoids the pedantry, obscurity and technicality to which academics are notoriously prone. And even when these vices are avoided, some students will have as much trouble seeing why they should interest themselves in a critical debate over "Dover Beach" as in "Dover Beach" itself.[43]

Graff goes on to attribute students' indifference or incomprehension to their "alienation from academic intellectual culture,"[44] which leads him to the conclusion that this "is all the more reason for teaching the debate."[45] But putting it this way simply leads us back to the place that Kaufmann began, i.e., the task of letting the text somehow challenge our ideas and beliefs.[46] If humanities instructors have no clear idea of this, how will they ever know whether they are indeed overcoming student alienation and teaching conflicts? As Kaufmann put it, "every reader tends to see what he likes and not see what makes him uncomfortable. Least of all does one think of the author as a human being like oneself."[47] Humanistic education will only be effective if it strives to overcome this partial vision. Pedagogy aiming to "teach the conflicts" should be informed by the Socratic ethos that Kaufmann evokes. Indeed, for college students to profit from teaching the conflicts at all their earlier education must prepare to have high standards of responsibility in making intellectual judgments. Graff seems to want these standards, but does not talk about what they are or how students are to obtain them. This point was brought out well in a perceptive and critical review of *Clueless in Academe* by Sandra Stotsky. She made the point that college English students are unlikely to use Graff's guidelines to integrate themselves into intellectual culture if, earlier, "they have not learned that they must first read and try to understand what the author wrote."[48] From this perspective, Kaufmann's work is not only relevant for debates in higher education, but for discussions of education as a whole.

Back to Ourselves

In the end, Kaufmann re-directs attention from questions about technique and sectarian academic schools to focus it on purposes and goals. One of the nastiest—but I think one of the most helpful—comments he made in his book concerns the doleful consequences of an academic system that discouraged reflection on these themes:

> For roughly twenty years, from about 1950 until 1970, large numbers of students entered graduate schools and then went on to teach philosophy, or history, or religion, literature, or art, without ever having seriously reflected on their goals. Going into graduate work was rarely experienced as a fateful plunge; on the contrary, it meant staying in school for a few more years, a prolongation of the status quo.[49]

Kaufmann concluded:

> Obviously, something had gone wrong in education some time before this.

> When so many people trained in the humanities, and quite especially in philosophy had examined their own lives and goals so little, their own training must have been a far cry from the heritage of Socrates.[50]

As I see it, this is not a personal swipe (or, not only one). Instructors willing to reflect on their own goals probably (perhaps not invariably) will be willing to reflect on and confront the intertwined goals of a text.[51] This starts the "culture shock."

It is also what makes Kaufmann relevant to ongoing practical discussions in education, ones involving assessment and testing. It is obvious from Kaufmann's reverence for texts that he would be hostile to humanities education that focused on what it called "process" in distinction to the specific arguments and visions contained in any given work. For this same reason, it is not surprising to learn that Kaufmann looked with suspicion in the assessment humanities education. Speaking not only of multiple choice exams, but of an essay competition where there is an overriding moral and intellectual consensus of what constitutes the right answer he notes that "such tests serve notice that what is desired is scholasticism." Then he adds:

> Those with a vision of their own or, more simply, students with some originality are not favored by such tests; and the Socratically inclined who love to question the consensus and who look with a critical eye and the four answers of which one and only one is supposed to be right learn that this posture does not pay. More important still, more and more secondary school teachers precisely at the best schools in which many students want to go on to a good college began to prepare their students for these tests. Students who were not used to such tests were at a great disadvantage; students whose education had been designed to prepare them for these tests had been trained not to be Socratic or original.[52]

There is a link between this system of testing and assessment and corps of humanities instructors who do not confront their own "big picture."[53] In each case, for Kaufmann, the prospects for the humanities depend on more than adopting new policies. He wants its adherents to take a different attitude toward themselves. The practical implications of this will be spelled out in the conclusion.

Conclusion: Reflection and Goals

Here are some practical suggestions I feel follow from a reading of Kaufmann. They are an elaboration on what Graff called the "so what" question. Both those sympathetic and unsympathetic with everything said so far will want to know whether *The Future of the Humanities* has indeed actually shaped anyone's teaching. Here are two ways it influenced mine:

◆ Kaufmann's book strengthened an already held opinion that what is really at stake in the humanities is honesty. In particular, Kaufmann's book makes a good case that humanities classes should be "Socratic" in the sense that they enable us to identify unexamined assumptions in past and present civilizations, and then consider their viability. In practice, this means that the texts I assign (my canon) are texts I think lead us to confront reigning values, either reaffirming or critiquing them (or both). Following this, I ask students to read and discuss the works where they must keep asking themselves whether they are truthfully identifying the texts main challenges, and whether they are grappling with these challenges with genuine candor. My writing assignments are more systematized versions of these two questions. Though my classes are for undergraduates, I see no reason why teachers of younger students could not adapt Kaufmann's ideas for their own ends.

◆ Saying that the humanities are about honesty raises a highly charged issue in current pedagogical debates, namely accountability. How does one hold an instructor accountable for conveying the distinctive voice of a text, or for exposing students to the challenge it represents? Kaufmann's suspicion of standardized testing should not be taken to mean that he recognized no gauge for assessing integrity in teaching. Rather, he would ask us to redirect our attention to justifications offered for a particular course of study. This would require faculty and departments, on the one hand, to describe in more detail what they expect students to learn, paying attention not to abstractions and generalizations, but to the distinctive particularities of the works studied. On the other hand, it would ask students and member of the public in general to be more forthcoming about what they expect to retain. Humanities instructors can be accountable for the ways they present the challenges of the material, but they cannot be accountable for an individual's capacity to make something of this experience. In this respect, the true test of accountability for both students and teachers is their ongoing commitment to remember what they study and incorporate its lessons into their lives. From this angle, though Kaufmann may not endorse testing in a narrow sense, he might be taken to call for it in a broader one. It would be both helpful and revealing if not only students, but faculty, administrators, state legislators, journalists, clergy and anyone else taking public stands on the state of education would submit to substantive tests on the depth and quality of their general education. These exams might not produce the most reassuring results. However, in an age where US Congressmen serving on important foreign policy committees are unable to tell the difference between Shiites and Sunnis,[54] such self-recognition would point out the

need for Kaufmann's main claim that we must reflect continually on education's purpose. It would also force us to ask not only whether are humanities classes are effective, but why this is the case.

Finally, Kaufmann's book helps one cope with the inevitable mortality of the humanities, and its possible replacement by new branches of the natural sciences. Just as the votive statues and oracle bones of past ages testify to the very large number of human values systems that have been forgotten, ignored or abandoned, so too, future generations (should there be any) could easily relegate all our current efforts to a small, esoteric, and perhaps not entirely edifying, nook in the history of the human knowledge. Nevertheless, what future generations might or might not think should not influence us. Someday people may eliminate the need for rational discussion, the encounter with distinctive points of view, and the honest consideration of alternatives. Until now, the natural sciences have not been able to come up with viable replacements for these practices. Perhaps they never will, though it seems probable that they will make some very good efforts in trying. Until then, I think the best way to think about the future of the humanities is to take Kaufmann's warnings about "blindness" to heart, and—to say it more time—never stop reflecting on aims and goals.

Notes

[1] An interesting and salutary reminder of how current debates might not be as current as we think can be found in a 1930 essay by Sherlock Bronson Gass entitled "The Well of Discipline, " reprinted in *Humanism and America*, ed. Norman Foerster (Farrar and Reinhardt: 1930). Speaking as a humanist, Gass worried openly about "the contrast between the fruitfulness of the scientific world, its vitality, its harmony, its worldwide cooperation, and our frankly acknowledged moral bankruptcy—vigor and fecundity into the area into which discipline has been shifted and chaos in the area in which discipline has been withdrawn." (p. 283) While Gass's understanding of "moral bankruptcy" may no longer be in perfect accord with contemporary concerns, his sense of alarm that the humanities are not proficient and adequate in the areas where they most need to be is an ongoing one, and thus one that should be addressed with an eye toward the ways it has been treated in the past.

[2] Walter Kaufmann (with a new introduction by Saul Goldwasser), *The Future of the Humanities: Teaching Art, Religion, Philosophy Literature and History* (Transaction Publishers: 1995), first published by Readers Digest Press in 1977. Henceforth, this book is referred to as "*TFH*."

[3] Naturally, the critical nature of present concerns will press for a continual discussion of the future of the humanities, and that of education in general. An especially helpful bibliographic overview of these discussions, particularly as

they relate to the future of higher education, is to be found at an Ohio State University website: http://humanities.osu.edu/news/forums/spring03/bibliography.cfm. In the Spring of 2003, OSU sponsored a forum on the future of the public research university. The useful "readings of interest" they provide underscore the importance of inquiring into the ends of humanities education altogether.

[4] For the "art of reading," see pages 47-83 in *TFH*.

[5] See Graff's 1992 *Beyond the Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts can Revitalize American Education* (Norton: 1992) and his 2003, *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind* (Yale University Press: 2003).

[6] *The Portable Nietzsche*, translated and edited by Walter Kaufmann (Viking Books: 1954). In all, Kaufmann translated and commented on *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, *Beyond Good and Evil*, *Genealogy of Morals*, *The Birth of Tragedy*, *The Gay Science*, *Twilight of the Idols*, *Nietzsche Contra Wagner*, *The Antichrist*, *Ecce Homo*, and the posthumous notes titled, *The Will to Power*.

[7] *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (Princeton University Press: 1950, 1956, 1968, 1974).

[8] *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre* (World Publishing Company: 1956, expanded edition, New American Library: 1975).

[9] *Critique of Religion and Philosophy* (Anchor Books: 1958) and *The Faith of a Heretic* (first published, 1959, 1060, 1961, Meridian Edition: 1975).

[10] *Tragedy and Philosophy* (Doubleday: 1968) and *Religions in Four Dimensions* (Reader's Digest Press: 1975).

[11] Although German-Jewish intellectual migration to America is an enormously important topic, much of its impact remains to be explored. For information on the general phenomenon, see *The Muses Flee Hitler: Cultural Transfer and Adaptation, 1930-1945*, Jarrell C. Jackman and Carla M. Borden, eds. (Smithsonian Institution Press: 1983).

[12] This can be seen in a website about Kaufmann hosted by Andrew Spear: http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~adspear/Kaufmann%20entrance.htm. Spear provides a full listing of Kaufmann's writings and reaches a wide variety of readers, academics and non-academics alike. There are not many published studies of Kaufmann's works, though this is changing. Jennifer Ratner-Rosenhagen of the University of Miami has a forthcoming article on Kaufmann, "Dionysian Enlightenment."

[13] See the *Symposium*, 216a.

[14] Walter Kaufmann, *Critique of Religion and Philosophy*, p. 10. This point is amplified in several other places in Kaufmann's writing. See, especially, his *The Faith of a Heretic* (1959, 1961). There books combine an anti-authoritarianism with a deep respect for tradition. This lays the foundation for the notion Kaufmann developed in *The Future of the Humanities* that instructors do not need to claim an air of infallibility in order to help students identify errors in the past.

[15] *TFH*, p. 154.

[16] *TFH*, p. xxix

[17] Page Smith's *Killing the Spirit* (Viking: 1990) makes some of the same

points, albeit for somewhat different reasons. It is interesting to compare these two works as pendant volumes.

[18] The point is made directly on *TFH*, p. 47, "Reading is the core of the humanities and social sciences, but most students never learn to read well." It is interesting to read these comments in conjunction with what Robert M. Hutchins had said earlier in his *Great Books: The Foundation of a Liberal Education* (Simon and Schuster: 1954).

[19] *TFH*, p. 63.

[20] *TFH*, p. 59.

[21] In his *Discovering the Mind, Volume One: Goethe, Kant and Hegel* (Transaction: 1991, first published 1980), Kaufmann went as far as to argue that even an undeniably great philosopher like Kant could advance hypotheses that were a "disaster" (p. 5) when it came to advancing human self-knowledge. A separate discussion would be required to grasp why he said this, but it helps bring out the point that Kaufmann did not presume that taking up the most forbidding ideas of a well-regarded writer was, in and of itself, the royal road to good pedagogy.

[22] *TFH*, p. 48. For a specific illustration of why Kaufmann felt this was the wrong approach, see the critique of Heidegger in *Discovering the Mind, Volume Two: Nietzsche, Heidegger and Buber* (Transaction: 1991, first published 1980), especially p. 195-97.

[23] *TFH*, p. 55.

[24] *TFH*, p. 57.

[25] *TFH*, p. 58. The notion of a "You" in a text may remind American readers of Martin Buber. Yet the claim that knowledge—particularly knowledge in the humanities—required a kind of empathy that "re-constructed" the thoughts of others was well established in the German intellectual tradition. A important figure in this respect, and an author with whom Buber and Kaufmann were familiar was Wilhem Dilthey (1833-1991). His *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften* has been translated into English as *Introduction to the Human Sciences* (Princeton: 1985), ed. Rudolph A. Makkrel and Frithjof Rodi. Even if one disagrees with some of Dilthey's main contentions, more familiarity with this work would enrich the debate of the humanities in the US.

[26] Without question, one of the abiding concerns of twentieth-century literary criticism has been the effort to demonstrate the ostensible naiveté of presuming unproblematic "given meanings in the interpretation of texts. For a now standard work in this regard see Stanley Fish's *Is there a Text in this Class: The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Harvard: 1980). Kaufmann, for his part, never spoke of timeless and pre-discursively given meanings. Rather, his concern was that, in the search for meaning, people did not abandon what Nietzsche called "the intellectual conscience" or the careful reflection on objection and alternate arguments.

[27] *TFH*, p. 165.

[28] *TFH*, p. 165.

[29] *TFH*, p. 166.

[30] *TFH*, p. 167.

[31] An interesting "macro" overview of the events Kaufmann describes in found in Bruce A.

[32] Kimball's *Orators and Philosophers: History of the Idea of Liberal Education* (College Entrance Examination Board: 1995). Much of Kaufmann's account is commensurate with what Kimball reports, though Kimball sees the roots of specialization beginning in pre World War II days. *TFH*, p. 175.

[33] Kaufmann's praise of self-discipline is best understood in light of his appropriation of Nietzsche. On p. 162 of *TFH*, he wrote that, "without self-discipline there is no mastery of any kind, nor autonomy, nor creativity that keeps on yielding satisfaction. Self-discipline is not enough, but those who lack it head for slavery or despair, or both." Despite the notion, popular in some quarters, that Nietzsche preached a wild liberation from all restrain, in his own work on Nietzsche, Kaufmann emphasized Nietzsche's arguments in favor of self-mastery, and his conviction that self-overcoming is the precondition for all educational progress. Along these lines, the one specific recommendation Kaufmann made for pre-college education is to point out that "children will soon cease to get much satisfaction from their work if they do not feel that they are making progress and can point to an occasional triumph." (p. 162) Turning everything into progress and triumph and treating that as the only possible outcome undermines education. To see how this follows from Kaufmann's understanding of Nietzsche see p. 216 of his short essay "How Nietzsche Revolutionized Ethics" reprinted in *From Shakespeare to Existentialism* (Princeton: 1979, first published 1959).

[34] Kaufmann's student, Ivan Soll, argued that though Kaufmann did not live to see the predominance of postmodernism in certain sectors of academia, what he has to say about the abandonment of meaning as an intellectual ideas remains relevant today. See Soll's introduction to *Discovering the Mind, Volume Two: Nietzsche, Heidegger and Buber* (Transaction: 1991, first published 1980).

[35] Introduction, *TFH*, p. xxi.

[36] *TFH*, p. 129.

[37] For a full outline of the course, see *TFH*, p. 134-36.

The hottest field in education has its own magazine

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION—The quarterly independent magazine serving multicultural educators at all levels gives you all the information, all the issues, all the controversies and connections you need to be part of this growing movement. Here's what you get every issue:

◆ **Feature articles** by major figures, practitioners and writers in the field—names like Peter McLaren, Herbert Kohl, James Banks, and Christine Sleeter, on topics ranging from the Tomahawk Chop to Spike Lee's *Malcolm X*;

◆ **Research articles** provide the latest findings and recommendations as scholars continue to examine this developing field;

◆ **Promising Practices**—What really works in multicultural classrooms at all levels, from pre-K to postsecondary;

◆ **Reviews** of books and films, some high-profile, some relatively undiscovered, seen from a multicultural perspective;

◆ **Personal perspectives** on art, poetry, technology, and other contemporary issues and concerns in the field.

❑ YES. Please enter my one-year subscription to *Multicultural Education* magazine at $50 (individuals) or $100 (institutions/libraries) (add $60 if outside the U.S.).

Name_____

Address_____

City/State/Zip_____

E-mail address_____

❑ Check enclosed (Payable to Caddo Gap Press)

Charge to: ❑ Visa ❑ Mastercard

Card # _____ Exp. Date_____

Signature_____

Caddo Gap Press

3145 Geary Boulevard, San Francisco, California 94118 U.S.A.

Telephone 666-3012; Fax 415/666-3552; E-Mail caddogap@aol.com

Towards a Theory of Work Satisfaction:
An Examination of Karl Marx and Frederick Herzberg

Richard G. Lyons
University of Massachusetts at Lowell

Introduction

Americans lead the western world in the number of hours spent at work. Why do we work so hard? One answer is that we enjoy our jobs. Work brings us satisfaction. This essay argues that work satisfaction not only entails enjoyment but also three ethical considerations as well. Two of these ethical concerns speak to the development of talents and community interest; the third addresses the subjective quality of ethical claims. Work is discussed using two models. The ethical model put forth by Karl Marx and the psychological one proposed by Frederick Herzberg. The essay ends with a few comments on how their views should be modified, amended and ignored.

Karl Marx's Ethical Model

Marx begins his analysis of work satisfaction with a look at capitalist production. What is produced is often useless, even dangerous. Production decisions are based on profit rather than public benefit. To use his terms, capitalism is dominated by exchange value rather than use value. What to produce should be based on objective moral criteria, not immoral motives like exchange value. Moreover, work satisfaction cannot be achieved when nature is exploited for small interest. Air and water must used for community objectives. Marx also cautions that work under capitalism emphasizes competition and selfishness, making friendships unusual. In sum, work alienates us from what we produce, the natural environment,

our latent talents and each another. Work satisfaction should have a moral base and speak to producing useful goods and services, stimulating our capacities, forming meaningful relationships and appropriating natural resources for useful purposes (Marx, 1977, 75-96).

Work alienation refers to the objective social conditions of work and does not depend on the opinion of the worker. Enjoying work is not a guarantee that it is unalienating. For instance, under capitalism people compensate for lack of satisfying jobs by exalting their animal qualities. He observes:

> The result we arrive at then is that man (the worker) only feels himself freely active in his animal functions of eating, drinking, and procreating, at most also in his dwelling and dress, and feels himself an animal in his human functions. Eating, drinking, procreating, etc., are indeed truly human functions. But in the abstraction that separates them from other rounds of human activity and makes them into final and exclusive ends they become animal. (Marx, 1977, 80-81)

Pleasure become the single motive in life since it connects so quickly to part of our humanity. The quick fix before and after work is their daily highlight. Yet, when food, drink, and sex dominate life, they diminish our humanity since they ignore our wider possibilities. Ironically, the morally uninformed may enjoy such a life.

An issue for Marx is how to move from a so-called incorrect moral evaluation of work to a correct one. Why should people agree with his ideas of work if they are happy with their so called alienating jobs? What is wrong with a miner who enjoys his alienating job? Marx insists that the miner suffers from a false consciousness or what Herbert Marcuse calls "euphoria in unhappiness" (Marcuse, 1974, 50). Euphoria refers to their personal reaction while unhappiness refers to missing more reasonable possibilities. According to Marx, workers should be reeducated so they can judge work correctly. V. I. Lenin took this idea a step further and told disgruntled workers that it should be impossible to experience work dissatisfaction since they owned the means of production (Lenin, 1965, 35-277). The personal realization of alienation is the first step towards organizing for better working conditions. On the other hand, the denial of alienation may well retard this movement. Satisfied yet alienated workers are often compliant.

Marx also noted that unsatisfying work can be highly productive. We should endure unsatisfying work when it is the best agent to relieve poverty. The same dull work endured by the miner changes its alienating quality when used to fight poverty. This is a curious idea that concerns the ways ends influence means. In many cases, he thought, the realization of an ideal goal can take the sting out of dull work. How long we can postpone this separation is another issue (Marx, 1977, 115-17). Instead of offering

specific definition of poverty, Marx gives the state the power to declare what constitutes inadequate food, clothing, shelter and medical care.

In sum, Marx looks at work in three ways. The first is alienating work which appeals to morally objective criteria. The second is meaningful work that escapes its unsatisfying dimension when it is used to fight poverty. The third is unalienating work. Unalienating work refers to work as a liberating experience. What are these experiences? Marx notes:

> Supposing that we had produced in a human manner, each of us would in his production have doubly affirmed himself and his fellow man. I would have: Objectified in my production my individuality and its peculiarity and thus both in my activity enjoyed an individual expression of my life and also in looking at the object we have had the individual pleasure of realizing my personality was objective, visible to the senses and thus a power beyond doubt. (Marx, 1966, 11)

This view of work addresses communist society where production is not the prime motive to work. These reciprocal connections between producer and consumer involves choices on what to produce based on consumer feedback. It is not an active and passive relationship but a creative concord. In other words, work cannot be gratifying to the producer if it is harmful to the consumer or helpful to the consumer while harmful to the producer.

This thin outline of Marx suggests that work satisfaction has a moral quality. This moral approach to work becomes apparent when contrasted with the psychological approach of Frederick Herzberg.

Frederick Herzberg's Psychological Theory of Work

Herzberg's theory is a reaction to the theories of Frederick Taylor and Elton Mayo. Taylor focused on merit and productivity (Taylor, 1911, 41-47). Employees were tested for skills and attitudes towards money. Jobs were broken down into simple time units that could be easily mastered by certain people. Management's job is to match people with task. In many cases, productivity increased, profits rose and employees paid better. Work had no intrinsic appeal. A good job paid well, a great one even better. Taylor saw good pay as an investment in productivity. V. I. Lenin saw Taylor's ideas as a better way to manage poverty by increasing productivity (Lenin, 1965, 259).

Elton Mayo helped design the famous Hawthorne studies. They found that productivity was controlled by group norms rather than the personalities and talents of employees (Mayo, 1945, 42). Employees banded together to control productivity as a reaction to perceived poor treatment. The studies also claimed that ability did not relate to productivity. Group norms controlled output. Work satisfaction and productivity

were tied to wages and working conditions. Mayo treated employees as a class rather than individuals and concluded "that the behavior of the individual within the factory can be predicted before employment upon the basis of a laborious and minute examination by test of his mechanical and other capacities is mainly, if not wholly mistaken" (Baritz, 1965, 95). Sociology replaced psychology as the way to understand employees motives, productivity, and management-employee relations.

Herzberg views Mayo as an extension of Taylor. Both failed to distinguish between the intrinsic qualities of work, such as developing abilities and the extrinsic qualities, such as salary. Herzberg also questions their other assumption. That the motivation to work could be understood using one class of appeals. Work satisfaction does not stem from our need to make money, as Taylor thought, or the need to be treated fairly, as Mayo argued. Rather, Herzberg argues, work appeals to two criteria—the desire to develop talents and avoid pain. Taylor and Mayo, he argues, speak only to the pain avoidance quality of work.

Herzberg makes a distinction between factors that make for job satisfaction and the development of talent as opposed to those that trigger dissatisfaction and pain. When people feel dissatisfied with pay, they do not feel satisfied after a pay boost. They register no work dissatisfaction, not work satisfaction. Instead, work satisfaction comes from the satisfiers or motivators that include the work itself, achievement, recognition, responsibility, and advancement. The pain avoiders include the relationships with colleagues, supervisors, and administrators , along with working conditions and salary. Herzberg argues:

> Stating the concept presents a problem in semantics, for we normally think of satisfaction and dissatisfaction as opposites—i.e., what is not satisfying must be dissatisfying, and vice versa. However, when it comes to understanding the behavior of people in their jobs, more than a play on words is involved. Two different needs of man are involved here. One set of needs can be thought of as stemming from his animal nature—the built in drive to avoid pain from the environment, plus all the learned drives which become conditioned to the basic biological needs. The other set of needs relate to the unique human characteristic, the ability to achieve and, through achievement, to experience psychological growth. (Herzberg, 1968, 147)

Taylor and Mayo use a traditional one-continuum model to measure work. Salary, benefits and other measures of work are plotted on a horizontal line. One end expresses work satisfaction, the other dissatisfaction. Using salary as a criterion to measure work, one would have work satisfaction when pay is high and dissatisfaction when low. When additional standards are used, one would simply add their scores

to calculate an overall score for work satisfaction (May & Decker, 1988, 143-144).

Figure 1 details a one-continuum either or model of work satisfaction/ dissatisfaction. Figure 2 summarizes Herzberg's bi-polar theory. Figure 3 speculates on the levels of work satisfaction using Herzberg's model.

Figure 1
A Traditional Either Or Model of Work Satisfaction

Positive Response	Standards	Negative Response
Work Satisfaction	Achievement	Work Dissatisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Recognition	Work Dissatisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Work Itself	Work Dissatisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Responsibility	Work Dissatisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Advancement	Work Dissatisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Company Policy	Work Dissatisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Administration	Work Dissatisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Supervision	Work Dissatisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Interpersonal Relationships	Work Dissatisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Salary	Work Dissatisfaction

This measure of work satisfaction would weigh each standard in a complex of positive and negative responses to arrive at an overall measure of work satisfaction.

Figure 2
Herzberg's Theory of Work Satisfaction

Positive Response	Standards of the Motivator Factors	Negative Response
Work Satisfaction	Achievement	No Work Satisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Recognition	No Work Satisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Work Itself	No Work Satisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Responsibility	No Work Satisfaction
Work Satisfaction	Advancement	No Work Satisfaction
Positive Response	Standards of the Maintenance Factors	Negative Response
No Work Dissatisfaction	Company Policy	Work Dissatisfaction
No Work Dissatisfaction	Administration	Work Dissatisfaction
No Work Dissatisfaction	Supervision	Work Dissatisfaction
No Work Dissatisfaction	Interpersonal Relationships	Work Dissatisfaction
No Work Dissatisfaction	Salary	Work Dissatisfaction

Herzberg's theory brings a weighted value, which separates the motivators from the maintenance factors. The motivators are more important in

understanding what motivates people and should increase productivity. We should keep in mind that he does not show that motivated workers are more productive. Herzberg simple assumes, in an analytical sense, that workers who are highly motivated must be more productive than unmotivated ones.

Figure 3
An Overall Model of Work Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction Suggested by Herzberg's Theory.

In order of preference:		
1. Work Satisfaction	and	No Work Dissatisfaction
2. Work Satisfaction	and	Work Dissatisfaction
3. No work Satisfaction	and	No Work Dissatisfaction
4. No Work Satisfaction	and	Work Dissatisfaction

Conclusion

Herzberg uses psychological criteria to measure work satisfaction. He fails to understand that decisions on what to produce involve not only moral questions but also how those choices affect nature and a sense of community. He does offer, however, a coherent theory on the relationship between work and the developments of ones capacities. Nevertheless, with his logic, we can enjoy work satisfaction while producing cocaine.

Herzberg sees labor and management cooperating when employees are highly skilled and motivated by the satisfiers. Productivity requires a satisfied employee. Car assembly is another matter. The motivators are not as productive as the pain avoiders, making labor-management relations contentious. Who then gets the lousy car assembly jobs? Herzberg thinks that unsatisfying work might go to people who are motivated by the pain avoiders. Thanks to the American school's loyalty to consumerism and pain avoidance, these people are easy to find (Herzberg, 1966, 83). Ironically, if schools turn out students who are attracted by the motivators, their graduates may not find satisfying work. After all, productivity rather than work satisfaction determines whether the satisfiers or motivators will operate.

Herzberg does not address how personality affects notions of good work. Yet, his research shows a high percentage of people motivated by salary. In fact, all the pain avoiders have a large minority who view them as satisfiers. Furthermore, he studies jobs that are largely male. His analysis is not gender neutral. Women, for instance, may well place more emphasis on relationships with colleagues because of social expectations and more concern on salary because of inequities.

The large difference between Herzberg and Marx is how they measure work satisfaction. For Marx, work must be driven by moral intuitions that concerns nature, the development of talents, the objects of work and human interactions. Herzberg, however, is reality rather than morality bound. What counts is the experience of working people and not what they should experience. He finds an Old Testament base for his moral view that we should seek growth and avoid pain. Yet, the content of this dictum as expressed in the motivators and pain avoiders is not biblical. To argue that the Old Testament provides a moral argument for personal achievement and pain avoidance does not translate into a sharp difference between motivators and pain avoiders. The Old Testament, for instance, does not say that relationships with colleagues and salary are based on pain avoiders rather than motivators.

The point is that Herzberg's model of dividing work into a hierarchy is a moral claim with a psychological justification. The view that professional people experience work satisfaction along these lines does not translate into they should experience work satisfaction along these same lines. He needs to provide a criteria to show that the production of cocaine is a moral issue. Work satisfaction is more than an examination of people's reactions to their jobs. Herzberg, for instance, refers to people who are motivated by "dissatisfies" as neurotic. A factual claim when he should also rely on a moral argument to judge motivation (Herzberg, 1966, 83-91). People who are motivated by the "dissatisfiers" rather than the satisfiers should be criticized from a moral perspective. Yet, we do not have a logic that can render someone immoral from a descriptive base. Ethical judgment must stand with moral premises, not factual ones.

Herzberg's theory fits well when looking at producing goods and services with market demand. His theory simply falls short of the mark because it fails to give an indication as to what is worthwhile to produce. We should not endorse our jobs when the satisfiers are present and the "dissatisfiers" absent. Job satisfaction, as Marx points out, should include ideas on what is useful and how nature and people are affected. Herzberg's theory is also limited because the satisfiers are tied too closely to increased productivity. Dull work is justified even when it is only slightly more productive than work done by robots.

Marx, on the other hand, argues that unalienating work should be the motive of life. However, his ideas on what constitutes unalienating work are vague, ignores personality and demands state coercion. Personal judgments are unimportant under state domination and should not be excused with his naïve promises of a communist state where subjective notions of work flourishes. Idealized goals are supposed to drive people to postpone unalienating work. When the promised revolution is com-

pleted, work will be linked to achievement through communal living. Such predictions are risky. The state can always rationalized failure to bring about unalienating work by pointing to their self-serving ways to establish poverty. State defined poverty is never quite defeated leaving in place unsatisfying work.

Marx also fails to appreciate the need to couple work satisfaction with liberty. Choice is central to work satisfaction and may be linked to productivity. His scary view that work satisfaction is established when the state owns the means of production ignores choice.

The ideas of Marx and Herzberg variously offer some good and bad advice. They rightly point out that a subjective criterion of work satisfaction ignores our capacity for error. We are capable of understating how work can develop our talents. Yet they go to the other extreme by arguing for a too objective view of work satisfaction. Marx argues from a moral view and Herzberg from a psychological one. Yet Marx's point that job satisfaction must include a moral base seems convincing, even if we rejects his moral conclusions. A blueprint of work satisfaction must include moral hunches on what to produce and how these choices affect the natural environment, the development of talents and the relationships between people.

Ideas on work satisfaction and how they motivate are elusive because of the diversity we bring to evaluate work. Work satisfaction has wide subjective borders. Evaluations on work reflects age, work experience, gender and even whim and fancy. Marx and Herzberg asks us to see work as the dominating motive in life. We should ignore this advice. Keep in mind that we are also mothers, husbands, gardeners, gamblers, and even Red Sox fans. To focus too closely on work is to risk devaluing how these other important roles provide us with perspective, novelty and something worthwhile to do in retirement. We need balance! Too much emphasis on work diminishes these other important roles while too little might allow us to enlarge them.

Note

I am grateful to Loni A. Lyons for her careful readings and suggestions.

References

Baritz, L. (1960). The servants of power. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: T. V. Crowell.

Herzberg, F. (1968).One more time: How do we motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review, 65* (January and February).

Herzberg, F. et al. (1997). *The motivation to work*. New Brunswick, NJ: Trans-

action.

Lenin, V. I. (1965). The immediate task of soviet government. In *Collected works* (Vol. 27). London, UK: Lawrence & Winhart.

Marcuse, H. (1974). *Eros and civilization*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Marx, K. (1977). Economic and philosophic manuscripts. In D. McLellan (Ed.), *Karl Marx: Selected writings*. London, UK: Oxford University Press. All references to Marx are from this edition, unless otherwise noted.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1966). Texte zu method und praxis. G. Hillman (Ed.), Hamburg, 1966, 11, 166ff. Translated by David Mc Lellan. *Review of Politics, 31*, 1969.

May, C. H., & Decker, R. H. (1988). Putting Herzberg's two factor theory of motivation in perspective. *Planning and Changing, 19*(3).

Mayo, E. (1945). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Boston: Beacon.

Taylor, F. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. London, UK: Harper.

Subscription Form for Journal of Thought

Please enter my subscription to Journal of Thought.

Name_____

Address_____

City/State/Zip_____

E-Mail Address _____

One Year subscription (four issues):

- ❑ $50 (individuals)
- ❑ $100 (institutions & libraries)

(Please add $60 for subscriptions outside the United States)

❑ Check enclosed (payable to Caddo Gap Press)

❑ Charge to ❑ VISA ❑ MasterCard

Card #_____ Exp. Date:_____

Signature:_____

Mail to:

Caddo Gap Press

3145 Geary Boulevard, PMB 275

San Francisco, California 94118 U.S.A.

Telephone 415/666-3012; Fax 415/666-3552;

E-Mail info@caddogap.com; Website www.caddogap.com

Aurobindo's Thought and Holistic Global Education

Stephen R. White
Appalachian State University

> The integral knowledge admits the valid truth of all views of existence, valid in their own field, but seeks to get rid of their limitations and negations and to harmonize and reconcile these partial truths in a larger truth .... It is not by "thinking out" the entire reality, but by a change of consciousness that one can pass from the ignorance to the Knowledge–the Knowledge by which we can become what we know. (Dalal, 2001, p. 3)
>
> —Sri Ghose Aurobindo (1872-1950)

The Age of Globalization

Contemporary global, political, social, and economic developments may forever transform the way we think about each other and influence the future social reality constructed. Latest acts of terrorism will certainly have an influential effect on humankind's collective psyche. The materialization of these emerging global issues are especially challenging for educators. As such, many assert that humankind now has a collective responsibility to facilitate the construction of a shared global culture through educational socialization. This is particularly true for those of us who are professionally committed to educating toward a future existence where peaceful cooperation and planetary citizenship become dominate values that are held in the same high regard as nationalism and individualism are today. Within this context it is critical that we reflectively contemplate what we teach and how we teach regarding these issues.

Some scholars view these developments of international change as the

emergence of a new social phenomenon. This social phenomenon coming to life is termed globalization. Globalization is the idea that humankind is evolving into an interconnected political socioeconomic system. The majority of scholars study globalization from the perspectives of transnational political conflicts in the quest for a world governance, the effect of global social interconnections on economic justice, and the impact of scientific and technological innovations on global relations (Baylis & Smith, 2001; Beck, 1999; Berger & Huntington, 2002; Bhagwati, 2004; Bloom, 2000; Bruteau, 2001; Foer, 2004; Friedman, 2000, 2005; Held & McGraw, 2000; Held, McGraw & Perraton, 1999; Hubbard, 1998; Steger, 2001; Stiglitz, 2002).

Nevertheless for many educators globalization has become a significant concern at all levels of learning, which is why they many seek to move the focus beyond being purely an international political and socioeconomic problem, to one that is viewed philosophically as a global humanitarian dilemma as well. In view of this increased interest in global education, we examine the ideas of Sri Ghose Aurobindo and Scott Forbes to determine the value of their thoughts on this subject. Before we examine their views, however, a succinct review of some relevant literature by global education theorists is undertaken. Special attention is given to how certain educators understand the problem of globalization, conceive of means to educate for it, and articulate global educational agendas.

Globalization and Global Education: A Literature Review

While other global education experts could have been selected, Patrick Fitzsimmons, Dean Peterson, Delores Wunder, Harlan Mueller, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, Val Rust, Bill Bigelow, Bob Peterson, Nicholas Burbles, Carlos Torres, Holger Daun, Nelly Stormquist, Karen Monkamn, and John Levin have been included to illustrate the diversity of thought in global education and the conceptual and philosophical challenges that exist. As we begin with Patrick Fitzsimmons, it is of interest that he contends that the political ideology of neo-liberalism is the social force behind the globalization movement, which he views as problematic because the neo-liberal agenda is a homogenizing process. Neo-liberalism advocates an international "politics of difference" under the guise of "global cooperation," which is a pretext that undermines genuine social solidarity and cohesion. He believes neo-liberalism is a conscious political deception advanced by a few international power brokers in order to advance their specific interests, and it is not an idea to motivate global unification or legitimate cooperation. Fitzsimmons proposes an educational agenda that promotes "critical localism" and

"critical regionalism." The goal of these two notions is to counterbalance the false perception of global unity and cohesion that current neo-liberalism fallaciously champions (Rizvi & Lingard, 2002).

The theory of "subjective globalization" is the focus of D. Peterson, Wunder, and Mueller's work. Subjective globalization is the idea that globalization requires a re-conceptualization from two perspectives: (1) personal identities and (2) nationalistic boundaries. Educational socialization into our era of globalization requires a transformation of learners' personal identities regarding "what" they represent and "who" they are within the context of cooperative global relationships. They believe that political nation-state boundaries are an artificial social reality of global segregation. This world-view undermines an individual's global identity and hinders collective social action. Thus an effective global education program must be designed specifically to assist learners to intellectually reframe their identity of self as existing within the larger integrated global community (Peterson, Wunder, & Mueller, 1999, pp. 19-20).

How can we infuse various issues regarding globalization throughout the curriculum is the concern of Aristide. Her contention is that the incorporation of globalization into the curriculum must be from the perspectives of "those from below"—marginalized Third World peoples. That is, global education must seek to help learners understand and improve the socioeconomic conditions of exploited peoples. Globalization demands that educators teach critically and explore various solutions from the views of those who suffer under the conditions brought about by recent global socioeconomic and political expansion (Bigelow & Peterson, 2002).

Globalization has had a deep impact on Third World educational policy. Burbles and Torres have researched how globalization has had an impact on educational policies and practices. They state: "[Our research] is primarily a work of theory, these discussions contain specific and concrete implications for how education is changing, and how we will need to change, in response to new [global] circumstances" (Burbles & Torres, 2000, p. 2). Their research has sought to identify political, social, and economic factors of globalization that are having a direct impact on the philosophy and policies of education in Third World regions and suggest alternative educational processes.

Likewise, Daun (2002) has also centered his work on the impact of global politics and economic interest on education. He thinks that First World national economic expansion is the real meaning of globalization. The result of this national interest is that education is serving as the forum for international political ideological wars. The idea of globalization simply provides the political context to argue for greater governmental bureaucratic oversight in order to increase the quantity

and quality of public education, globally. Economically powerful nations advance the idea of global cooperation and equality as a political veil in order to multiply capital gains through the exploitation of peoples in less influential nations. The economic interests of First World nations and groups are in constant need of skilled workers to increase their materialistic gains and the human resources supply is satisfied by increasing the educational level of marginalized peoples. Daun calls for the education of Third World peoples so that they become conscious of the First World interests and their potential for exploitation. When the social consciousness of marginalized peoples is elevated, they will become empowered to govern externally funded educational agendas so that their socioeconomic needs are met through their own formulated indigenous educational policies and programs.

Some global educators center their research on ways in which to develop a stronger knowledge base and on teaching and learning processes regarding globalization. Such is the case for Bigelow and B. Peterson who take a curricular and pedagogical position regarding globalization as an educational problem. For them the challenge of globalization for educators is to design innovative curriculum around life-world issues and to teach for global social justice. They write: "It is impossible to separate our teaching about wretched conditions of workers around the world from all the factors that produced the desperation that forces people to seek work in those conditions" (Bigelow & Peterson, 2002, p. 3).

Several educational theorists perceive globalization as a socioeconomic problem that is inherently a political issue of international conflict for power controls. Rust represents this camp of thinkers, in that he asserts that international economic motives extend the problem of globalization far beyond socioeconomic relationships. The issue of globalization is also a problem of nationalistic power conflicts. He advocates an activist educational agenda that advances the capitulation of our mental model of political sovereignty that essentially segregates nation-states into flash points of conflict. Rust believes that the emergence of transnational corporations, multinational socioeconomic consortiums, and the formation of global organizations (such as environmental associations) along with the conflicts that emerge between these groups are the problems to be addressed through global education programs (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000).

Geopolitics is also having an impact on educational thought. Within this context Stromquest and Monkman have explored the question of what kind of education will prevail in a globalized world:

> Will it only be to make us more productive and increase our ability to produce and consume or will it be able to instill in all of us a democratic

> spirit with values of solidarity? This solidarity will have to recognize the different interests among men and women and amongst the dominant groups and disadvantaged groups. (Stormqueist & Monkman, 2000, pp. 21-22)

What's more, Stromquist contends that educational theorizing about globalization is an intensely convoluted undertaking because it is a multifaceted sociological phenomenon and an intensely interdisciplinary educational dilemma. This is the case because the perception of globalization varies depending on the position that is being advanced when defining it. Globalization can be framed from conservative, neo-liberal, critical theory or postmodern perspectives while defining diverse problems such as global convergence and cultural divergence, worldwide social homogenization or global hetrogenization, and local needs that are in conflict with national, regional, and international interests (Stromquist, 2002, pp. 1-13).

Community college educator Levin states that globalization reflects a perception that the world is becoming a shared social space due to technological and economic forces. The globe has become so interconnected that there is now a common agreement that it is having a profound impact on education's conceptual framework in both Canada and the United States. He states:

> It may be that consciousness of a global society, culture, and economy and global interdependence are the cornerstones of globalization, and these—consciousness and interdependency—have saliency in knowledge based enterprises.... there is certain inevitability that higher education institutions, because of their cultural, social and economic roles, are caught up in and affected by globalization. (Levin, 2001, p. 9)

This succinct survey of these global educators reveals the diversity of thought regarding the conceptual and philosophical challenges that exist due to globalization. Obviously there does not exist "one best way" to meet the educational challenge, yet there is a consent that a genuine need does exist in global education requiring creative collective thinking about the future of humankind.

Perhaps due to the immediate impact of global political, social, and economic issues, idealistic thought holds minimal interest for most global educational thinkers and their agendas. Most global educators have a realist critical theory orientation toward globalization as solely being a conflict of power issues. Philosophical idealists, who visualize recent global developments as an opportunity to explore the possibility of greater social evolution beyond our present state of turmoil, have a small voice in educational dialogue. Nevertheless, we should not abandon the task of exploring new ideas and advancing novel visions of globalization that

can also be integrated into educational praxis. Holistic educational thought is one place for contextualizing rational idealistic thinking about globalization.

Forbes and Holistic Education Theory

The field of holistic education has as its primary goal the fullest possible development of learners' self-actualization. Such development of the learner includes higher levels of consciousness through educational intellectual development while also cultivating their relationship with others in society. The advancement of society is held to be a consequential correlation to facilitating a person's self-actualization. Thus, the concern of holistic educational theorists is to expand the learning processes beyond conventional modes of knowledge dissemination and competencies in order to include deeper levels of the individual's consciousness with the greater evolution of society as a consequence of the process.

Forbes is a theorist of holistic education, who has addressed the issue of placing social idealism in the curriculum along side the critical realism of life-world problems. He argues that social transformation will not occur without a sense of vital purpose, an idealistic vision for the future. He believes that an effective motive for social action will not emerge if there does not also exist the "Ultimate Ideas of Purpose." To educate towards the construction of a future social order that is a greater state of existence than our present social order without an idea of ultimate meaning is like putting the cart before the horse. Ideas of ultimacy construct for learners a meaningful mental model of selfhood that can result in collective social action. Holistic education is the proper theoretical forum from which to promote idealism of ultimate meaning (Forbes, 2003, pp. 18-22).

Forbes thinks that education can advance a shared idealistic vision of the future subjectively relevant to the individual and motivationally significant for the collective. He believes that the advancement of a positive vision of the future of humankind and the advancement of social progress is one of the noblest roles an educator can seek. However, effective social action requires as its foundation a positive idealistic concept of ultimacy. Thus, without a notion of ultimacy, it is impossible to educate learners toward constructing a meaningful understanding of globalization that has the inspirational power to transform consciousness and society (Forbes, 2003, pp. 22).

Given Forbes proposition, global educators can deduce that unless we construct ideas of Ultimacy it is not probable to educate learners toward constructing a meaningful perceptive of globalization that also has the motivational vigor to persuade them to become political and

social change agents. His hypothesis supports the suggestion in this work that the thought of Aurobindo is a worthy source from which to educationally construct an idea of Ultimacy regarding globalization.

Life of Aurobindo

Philosopher Aurobindo (1872-1950) can be viewed as a 20th Century Renaissance person. He was an avant-garde intellectual who intensely analyzed human and social evolution. In doing so, he sought to philosophically reconcile Western science with Eastern metaphysics into an integrative narrative of reality. Born in Calcutta, India, Aurobindo was educated at Cambridge University. His academic interests were interdisciplinary in scope: liberal arts, political science, sociology, psychology, philosophy and education. He was profoundly influenced by western thought; especially the realms of empirical positivism, rationalism, and romantic idealism. Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory, Henri Bergson's philosophy of cognitive evolution, and G. F.W. Hegel's idea of dialectical social evolution made a significant impression on his intellectual development and world-view. The idea of human evolution as perpetual motion became the cornerstone of his thought (Chaturvedi, 2002; Dalal, 2001; McGreal, 1995; Purani, 2001; Sethna, 1981; Susai, 1993).

After graduation from Cambridge, Aurobindo returned to India and became an extraordinary political statesmen and a passionate revolutionary in the people's struggle for national liberation from British governmental control. Due to the depth of his political activism, the British authorities labeled him the most dangerous revolutionary in India's battle for independence. Eventually he was captured and charged for sedition and imprisoned to solitary confinement. While in prison he went through a spiritual transformation. He claimed to have experienced a Divine presence "as all beings and all that is" and visualized reality as unified. As a result of this experience, he became deeply absorbed in the study of Hinduism. The Eastern notion of metaphysical monism, a non-dualistic Absolutely Reality that exists behind the empirical world of physical appearance, became infused throughout his thought along with that of perpetual evolution. Affection for him by the Indian people became legendary. In time, his fellow countrymen affectionately refer to him with the honorific designation of "Sri" Aurobindo (The term "Sri" is from the Sanskrit language, a Hindu honorific title meaning—"Master") (Bruteua, 1974; Feys, 1977; Heehs, 1989).

Around the time of the mid 1940s, Aurobindo became convinced that his political activism for India's nation-states was now complete. From this point forward he became committed to political action and

social service as being the process of advancing a conscious transformation of all humankind. He viewed himself as a spiritual revolutionary advocating a new politics of consciousness. He argued that because of humankind's unique evolution as a species, we were now the collective custodians of future evolution. From this realization, Aurobindo began writing volumes of scholarly works on social issues and while philosophically developing a metaphysical idealism of "Ultimacy" (Gandhi, 1992; Heehs, 1999; Singh, 1989; Varma, 1998).

Aurobindo believed that Hindu spirituality and meditative yoga would augment his new vision of political thought, social work, and the quest for self-realization as interconnected activities. Thus he developed a system of yoga—Integral Yoga. Integral Yoga seeks to change our inner-self (psyche) and outer-life (social disposition) as a manifestation of a higher level of consciousness. Overall, his system of yoga was a synthesis of Western psychology, which focuses on the outer personality and social behavior, with Eastern spirituality which focuses on the inner person and the psyche. In other words, Integral yoga is not a specific physical or psychological procedure, but it is to consciously surrender to the numinous energy that pushes the evolutionary process (Aurobindo, 1971, 1985a, 1990, 1993, 1998a; Dalal, 2003; Kluback, 2003; Overzee, 1992; Rishabachand, 1993; Susai, 1993; Vrekehm, 1998; Wygant, 2001).

Aurobindo states:

> The way of yoga must be a living thing not a mental [psychological] principal or a set [physical] method to be struck to against all necessary variations.... a spiritual evolution, an evolution of consciousness in matter is a contrast developing self-formation till the form can reveal the indwelling spirit...the central significant motive of the terrestrial existence. (Chaturvedi, 2002, pp. 54-55)

After the emancipation of India, Aurobindo devoted himself entirely, along with his wife, the French mystic Mirra Alfassa—referred to as The Mother, a Hindu honorific title—who would liberate the whole of humanity socially and spiritually by advancing psyche evolution and conscious transformation while pressing forward the construction of a new social reality of global unity (Bruteau, 1971; Vrekehm, 1998).

Indian scholar Atulindra Nath Chaturvedi portrays Aurobindo as one of the pillars of India's reawakening. He states:

> However, none [Tagore, Nehru, Ghandi] bridged the divide between the political and spiritual as did the political activist Aurobindo Ghose, who blazed across the political firmament like a shooting star then, as the sage Sri Aurobindo, became the beacon whose light still draws millions. How the political pathfinder in a nation striving for libera-

> tion transformed himself into a rational mystic with a universal vision remains a continuing puzzle. (Chaturvedi, 2002, p. 5)

We will now explore more deeply the thought and philosophical concepts of this most fascinating intellectual.

Aurobindoian Thought: Human Evolution toward Global Unity

Although he wrote volumes on various subjects, of interest to this study, there are two particular works that define Aurobindo's thought regarding human and social evolution. *The life divine* (1974a) can be viewed as his philosophical magnum opus while *The future evolution of man* (1974b) is his most ambitious sociological analysis. Both of these works are examples of his theoretical synthesis of Western evolutionary thought and Neo-Hinduism as a narrative of his thought regarding the relationship between psyche involution and social evolution (Heehs, 1999; Susai, 1993; Zaehner, 1971).

Aurobindo's vision of the future is connected to our understanding of previous evolutionary stages, present state of existence and the Eastern notion of monism, Absolute Reality. He describes evolution as an eternal process with a universal energy causing a dialectical intercourse because of our spiritual descent into the world, resulting in an evolutionary assent of the human psyche. The Aurobindoian idea being that involution is the incarnation of the divine on earth through decent into the human psyche. Within this context, Aurobindo asserts that planetary evolution has resulted in the creation of four distinct yet unified earthly realms with a corresponding reality: *Material realm* (physical reality), *life realm* (biological reality), *intellectual realm* (psyche-social reality), and *metaphysical realm* (higher consciousness-spiritual reality). Each earthly realm has a discernable evolutionary direction of the psyche's development and elevated appearance of the consciousness (Aurobindo, 1974a, 1974b, 1998b; Bruteau, 1974; Combs, 1996; Vrekhem, 1998)

He describes how matter evolved into life resulting ultimately in the emergence of the human species with an elevated level of consciousness. With the advent of the human species, a more complex process of evolution was set in motion. Because evolution is in perpetual motion, it follows that the human specie cannot be the end point of evolutionary movement but is a unique transitional state of being (Aurobindo, 1974a, 1974b, 1985a, 1985b, 1998a, 1998b; Combs, 1996; Dalal, 2001, 2003; McGreal, 1995; Vrekehm, 1998).

Aurobindo's theory of evolution states that within the four earthly realms seven evolutionary states of psyche (mind), with distinctive degrees of consciousness more elevated than the previous level, have

appeared: *Physical mind* is the most basic state of the brain producing elemental consciousness. *Vital mind* is the state of mind with a level of consciousness associated with meta-cognition and affective modes of thinking. *Higher mind* is an important transitional stage of evolution. It is a transitional state between base biological mind and that of reflective knowing (higher consciousness). *Illuminated mind* is a more complex level of consciousness that has characteristics of intuitive knowing and producing visionary thinking. *Intuitive mind* is a distinct state of mind and consciousness empowered by a perceptive awareness of Absolute Reality. This degree of consciousness is found manifested in extraordinary persons endowed with innovative insights and a novel sense of relevance regarding the future human evolution. *Over mind* is the next transitional state of mind. It is characterized by a transcendental level of consciousness and the cognitive ability for integrative thinking, holistic knowing and mystical insight. Accordingly, in our age a few individuals have emerged revealing this level of evolution. Those who have reached this evolutionary state are the pathfinders for future human evolution and advancing global-unity.

Supramind (that is Supermind) is the future highest level of psyche. It is a total transformation of the human species into a new breed of life and mind. While all the previous levels of minds are supported solely by physical and psyche realms of realities. Supramind is grounded upon Absolute Reality, the Life Divine. Supramind is the Life Divine fully manifested on Earth. He describes the Supramind as the human psyche bathed in divine energy that totally transforms consciousness and empowers individuals to reconstruct human relations into a new social reality of collective global unity (Refer to the Appendix: Diagram 1: Aurobindoian Global Idea of Psyche-Social Evolution) (Aurobindo, 1974a, 1974b, 1985b, 1991, 1998a, 1998c; Bruteau, 1971, 1974; Combs, 1996; Mukherjee, 1990; Satprem, 1984, 1985; Vrekehm, 1998).

Aurobindo writes:

> The animal is the living laboratory of the evolutionary urge, illuminating and change must take up and re-create the whole being, mind, life, and body: it must not be only an inner experience of the divinity but a remodeling of both the inner and outer existence by its power; it must take form not only in the life of the individual but as a collective life of Gnostic beings [Supermen]. (Aurobindo, 1974a, p.68)

Aurobindo asserts that the notion of Life Divine is not a theory of an other worldly reality, strictly an esoteric mysticism. Life Divine is a tangible energy infusing ever-higher expressions of consciousness bringing about greater global social evolution. Supramind results in individuals becoming fully aware of their uniqueness as well as their

psyche and social unification with others without perceived contradictions between the two. The complete involution of Life Divine on planet Earth will result in the birth of a new species, "Gnostic being," a being of knowledge, endowed with the capacity to steer future social evolution toward a state of global-unity (Aurobindo, 1998c; Mukherjee, 1990; Satprem, 1984, 1985; Vrekehm, 1998).

The involution of divine spirit into individual's psyche development is driving societies toward increasingly advanced levels of collective consciousness. As a result, societies will continue to evolve toward greater convergence constructing even higher degrees of collective consciousnesses and global social order.

He writes:

> The appearance of mind and body on earth makes a critical step, a decisive change in the course of evolution. There is an evolution of the consciousness behind the evolution of the species and this spiritual evolution must end in a realization, individual and collective, on the Earth. Man is a transitional being who has seen that there can be a higher status of consciousness than his own. ...the being has become awake and aware of himself; there has been manifest in mind its will to develop, to grow in knowledge, to deepen the inner and widen the outer existence to increase the capacities of nature. Man has seen that there can be higher states of existence than his own. For truth and knowledge is an idle gleam if knowledge brings not power to change the world. (Aurobindo, 1974b, p.51)

Aurobindo asserts that the convergence of humanity into a cooperative global-unity will not result in an impersonal society of estranged individuals. Conversely, the transformation of consciousness will result in persons becoming free of self-interested ego driven individualism through becoming reflectively aware of their own psyche development within the context of others experiencing the same process. He theorized that humankind has entered a new age of accelerated personal involution resulting in collaborative social evolution on a global scale. The immediate future of humankind can be understood as the collective transformation of humankind occurring on individual and social levels.

He steadfastly believed that human progress and global convergence is occurring despite persistent international socioeconomic strife and political conflict. These current international ills are evolutionary pangs of a new age being born where global social collaboration and planetary consciousness are its defining characteristics. The "Ultimate" future of human evolution is not merely an individual affair but a collective global one. The collective exists by the individual, not vice versa, and a perfected global community can exist only if the members are perfected.

The community exists to serve individuals, but it is the duty of the individual to sacrifice themselves for the sake of collective global unity. Accordingly he visualizes a future state of existence that will embrace us into a new collective social reality of authentic global-unity (Aurobindo, 1974, 1991; 1998a; 1998b; Bruteau, 1971).

We will now assess the relevance of Aurobindo's thought for global educators and how it is congruent with the goals of holistic educational thought. The hypothesis presented here is that a holistic global education learning agenda can be framed from the idealism of Auorbindoian thought, as well as provide the philosophical and social foundations from which to construct an idea of "Ultimacy" regarding globalization.

Aurobindo's Thought and a Holistic Global Education Agenda

Holistic educational thought thrives on advancing optimistic perspectives of humankind and society. The philosophical advocacy of exploring competing theoretical points of Ultimacy challenges educators to contemplate and honor diverse perspectives. The position in this work is that the utilization of Aurobindoian thought is within the philosophical disposition of holistic education and augments a novel global education agenda. We can conceive of this integrative synthesis between Aurobindoian thought and educating for our age of globalization as a model of a holistic global education agenda (Forbes, 2003).

Aurobindo's thought is an alternative perspective to the critical realist's critique of globalization. His theory is neither culturally eastern nor western in scope, but universally humanistic and globalist. His thought is not an analysis of globalization but is a global evolutionary mythos to be dialectically contrasted against diverse perspectives of globalization as demonstrated in the literature review of various global educators thought. The overriding educational agenda here is to provide learners with a futuristic and visionary idea of Ultimacy regarding globalization. Aurobindoian thought has core values that can serve as the foundational framework for a holistic global education agenda. A brief description of these core values follow:

- Perhaps the most significant educational value of Aurobindoian thought is the idea that humankind must become educated regarding the actual possibility of current globalization as a positive evolutionary movement. Aurobindo argued that contemporary political ideologies are insufficient to create a real sense of Ultimacy. Nationalism is an archaic idea exhausted of relevance to promote human solidarity and global-unity. Thus, what is required is a new sense of personal self-actualization and social identity within a global context.

u If humankind is to survive current international conflicts, then a radical transformation of human consciousness must first occur to reconstruct society as a new cooperative global social order.

u Humankind as a species is still in evolutionary movement, and our current state of existence is only a transitory one. Current evolutionary movement is part of the progression of humankind towards a point of global unity.

u Consciousness is the apex of past evolutionary phenomenon and the expansion of consciousness, on both the individual and collective level, is the Ultimate goal of future human evolution.

u Conscious transformation has now empowered humankind to steer future evolutionary movement. For the next social evolutionary apex to be fully realized demands collaborative action and global solidarity on the part of humankind.

u What must precede this positive state of globalism with the transformation of the individual's consciousness so that it is also committed to reconstructing society into a new global reality. The far distant future is visualized as holding positive possibilities that will ultimately refurbish humankind into a new species of intellectual essence and social behavior.

These core values imbedded in Aurobindoian thought contextualize current globalization within a futurist intellectual framework of ultimate concern. This assertion is congruent with holistic education and Scott Forbes hypothesis that advancing an idealism of Ultimacy can potentially result in desired individual self-actualization and social transformation (Aurobindo, 1985a, 1991, 1998b; Dowsett, 1977; Dowsett & Jayawal, 1976; Forbes, 2003; Kluback, 2003; McDermott, 1987).

In light of this assessment, Aurobindo boldly proclaimed:

> The coming of a spiritual age must be preceded by the appearance of an increasing number of individuals who are no longer satisfied with the normal intellect, vital, and physical existence of man, but perceive that a greater evolution is the real goal of humanity and attempt to effect it in themselves, and to lead others to it, and make it recognized goal of the race. In proportion as they succeed and the degree they carry this evolution, the yet unrealized potentiality, which they represent, will become an actual possibility of the future. (McDermott 1987; p. 7)

For the first time in the history of the Earth, humankind can consciously participate in its own evolution and in doing so direct its own journey into the future. This phenomenon presents an unprecedented opportunity for educators. Positive dispositions toward globalization can be advanced through meditative actions and reflective thoughts

opening up inestimable untapped human energies. Political, social and economic problems in which we perceive ourselves as being powerless to solve can be understood as providing us with unique opportunities to advance human progress (Aurobindo, 1985a, 1998a; Bruteau, 1971, 1974; Dalal, 2001, Gandhi, 1992; King, 1989; Kluback, 2003; Monor, 1998).

Again, Aurobindo writes (1974b):

> At present mankind is undergoing an evolutionary crisis in which is concealed a choice of its destiny; for a stage has been reached in which the humankind mind has achieved its certain directions and enormous development while in others it stands arrested and bewildered and can no longer find its way. A structure of the material life has been raised up by man's ever active mind and life-will, structure of unmanageable hugeness and complexity...Man has created a system of civilization which has become too big for his limited capacity and understanding. (Aurobindo, 1974b, p. 55)

Some Aurobindo followers argue that what is being defined as globalization is tangible empirical evidence of his theory of human evolution coming to past. Social and political interaction between the West and East, environmental awareness, advancements in science and technology and developments in global education are objective proofs of evolutionary movement toward global-unity and a shift in our collective consciousness (Chaturvedi, 2002; Hamilton, 2004).

K. D. Sethna observes:

> He [Aurobindo] kindles a vision and initiates a work that bears on the whole human situation... man in every mode and field—the thinker [educator], the scientist, no less than the artist and mystic—man individual and man collective—the modern breaker of ground side by side with the heir of the ages...Man is a transitional being, he is not final. The step from man to superman is the most approaching achievement of earth's evolution. It is inevitable because it is at once the intention of the inner spirit and the logic of Nature's process. Humankind must shake off the shackles of slavery to ignorance. (Sethna, 1973, p. 7)

Aurobindo challenges educators to participate in social evolution by nurturing the human energy necessary for future progress. He believed that educational institutions are "laboratories of evolution" and teachers are "evolution agents," leaders of the process. Educational curricular activities must be a synthesis of Western positivism with Eastern metaphysics, as well as other global cultural values (Aurobindo, 1995, 2000).

Sri Aurobindo died in the French colony of Pondicherry, India in 1950. Today he is venerated in India as a hero of the people, a champion of social justice, a great Hindu sage and global citizen (Paine, 1998). Mirra Alfassa (aka. the Mother), Aurobindo's wife and life-long colleague,

who established the Aurobindo Ashram and Educational Laboratory at Pondicherry, reflects on his thought: "Sri Aurobindo has come to announce to the world the beauty of the future that will be realized. He has come to bring not a hope but the certainty of the splendor towards which the world is moving. The world is not an unfortunate accident: it is a miracle moving towards its expression" (Vrekhem, 1997, p.xi).

Some critics may view Aurobindo's thought as being too esoterically speculative to have pragmatic application for a global education agenda. The predictable concern of such critics will be that such futuristic musing distracts us from appropriately educating for present day solutions of real problems that globalization presents educators. Yet while most educators analyze globalization with trepidation, some still wrap their minds tightly around the positive idea of globalization as being an evolutionary epoch moving humankind toward global collaboration and a heightened level of collective planetary consciousness. The belief being that for positive social change to occur, humankind must first be educated for the possibility of such change. Aurobindoian thought is a motif to think anew about globalization that nurtures a sense of Ultimacy for humankind.

Aurobindo States:

> The unification of mankind is underway, though only in an imperfect initiative, organized but struggling against tremendous difficulties.... which is not limited by present facts and immediate possibilities but looks into the future and brings it nearer, her presence may make all the difference.... international spirit and outlook must grow up and international forms and institutions; even it may be such developments as dual or multilateral citizenship and a voluntary fusion of cultures may appear in the process of the change....A new spirit of oneness will take hold of the human race...if this evolution is to take place. (Chaturvedi, 2002, pp. 69-71)

In closing, Aurobindo articulates an inspiring vision of Ultimacy regarding the future evolution of humankind and the emergence of a global psycho-social reality that can augment a holistic global education agenda in a new and novel way.

References

Aurobindo, S. (Ed. R.A. McDermott).(1971). *The mind of light*. New York: Dutton.

Aurobindo, S. (1974a). *The life divine*. Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press.

Aurobindo, S. (1974b). *The future evolution of man: The divine life upon earth*. Wheaton, IL: Quest Books—The Theosophical Publishing House.

Aurobindo, S. (1985a). *Social evolution towards the ideal of human unity*. Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press.

Aurobindo, S. (1985b). *Future poetry.* Twin Lakes, WI: Lotus Press.
Aurobindo, S. (1990). *A synthesis of yoga.* Twin Lakes, WI: Lotus Press.
Aurobindo, S. (1991). (6th edition). *The superman.* Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press.
Aurobindo, S. (1993). *Integral yoga: Sri Aurobindo's teaching and method of practice.* Twin Lakes, WI: Lotus Press.
Aurobindo, S. (1995) (2nd edition). *A new education for a new consciousness.* Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press.
Aurobindo, S. (1998a). *The ideal of human unity.* Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press.
Aurobindo, S. (1998b). (2nd edition). *Glossary of terms in Sri Aurobindo writings.* Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press.
Aurobindo, S. (1998c). *The human cycle: The psychology of social development.* Twin Lakes, WI: Lotus Press.
Aurobindo, S. (2000). *Sri Aurobindo and the mother on education.* Twin Lakes, WI: Lotus Press.
Baylis, J., & Smith. S (Eds). (2001). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Beck, R. (1999). *What is globalization?* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
Berger, P. L. & Huntington, S.P. (Eds). (2002). *Many globalizations: Cultural diversity in the contemporary world.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Bhagwati, J. (2004). *In defense of globalization.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
Bigelow, B., & Peterson, B. (Eds). (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world.* Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking School.
Bloom, H. (2000). *Global brain: The evolution of mass mind from the big bang to the 21st century.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.
Bruteau, B. (1971). *Worthy is the world: The Hindu philosophy of Sri Aurobindo.* Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press.
Bruteau, B. (1974). *Evolution toward divinity: Teilhard de Chardin and the Hindu tradition.* Wheaton, ILL: Theosophical Publishing House.
Bruteau, B. (2001). *The grand option: Personal transformation and a new creation.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
Burbules, N., & Torres, C.A. (Eds).(2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives.* New York: Routledge.
Chaturvedi, A.N. (2002). *Sri Aurobindo: The spiritual revolutionary.* New Delhi, India: Rupa & Co.
Combs, A. (1996). *The radiance of being: Complexity, chaos, and the evolution of consciousness.* St. Paul, MN: Paragon Books.
Dalal, A.S. (2001). *A greater psychology: An introduction to the thought of Sri Aurobindo.* New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher.
Dalal, A.S. (2003). *Our many selves: Practical yogic psychology.* Twin Lakes, WI: Lotus Press.
Daun, H. (Ed). (2002). *Educational restructuring in the context of globalization and national policy.* New York: Routledge.
Dowsett, N. C. (1977). *Psychology for future education.* Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Society.

Dowsett, N. C. & Jayawal, S.R. (1976). *Education for the future.* Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Society.

Feys, J. (1977). *The yogi and the mystic: Sri Aurobindo and Aurobindo de Chardin.* Calcutta, India: Firma KLM Ltd.

Foer, F. (2004). *How soccer explains the world: An unlikely theory of globalization.* New York: Harper Collins.

Forbes, S. H. (2003). *Holistic education: An analysis of its ideas and nature.* Brandon, VT: Foundation for Educational Renewal.

Freidman, T. L. (2000). *The lexus and the olive tree: Understanding globalization.* New York: Anchor Books.

Freidman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the 21st century.* Waterville, ME: Thorndike Press.

Gandhi, K. (1992). (2nd edition). *Social philosophy of Sri Aurobindo and the new age.* Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Ashram Publication Department.

Hamilton, C. (2004). The future of God, evolution and enlightenment for the 21st Century. *The Journal of Yoga.* Volume 3, Number 1, January.

Heehs, P. (1989). *Sri Aurobindo: A brief biography.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Heehs, P. (Ed). (1999). *The essential writings of Sri Aurobindo.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Held, D. & McGrew, A. (2002). *Globalization and anti-globalization.* Washington, DC: Polity Press.

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

King, U. (1989). *The spirit of one earth: Reflections on Aurobindo de Chardin and global spirituality.* New York: Paragon House.

Kluback, W. (2003). *Sri Aurobindo Ghose: The dweller in the lands of silence.* St. Paul, MN: Paragon House.

Levin, J.S. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the 21st century.* New York: Palgrave Books.

McDermott, R. (Ed). (1987). *The essential Aurobindo.* New York: Lindsfarne Books.

McGreal, I.P.(1995). *Great thinkers of the eastern world.* New York: Harper Collins.

Monor, R. (1998). *Sri Aurobindo: The perfect and the good.* Firma KLM:

Mukherjee, J.K (1990). *From man human to man divine: Sri Aurobindo's vision of the evolutionary destiny of man.* Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo International Center for Education.

Overzee, A. H. (1992). The *body divine: The symbol of the body in the works of Aurobindo, Teilhard de Chardin and Ramanuja.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Paine, J. (1998). *Father India: How encounters with an ancient culture transformed the modern west.* New York: Harper Collins.

Peterson, R., Wunder, D.F. & Mueller, H.L. (1999). *Social problems: Globalization in the twenty-first century.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Purani, A.B. (2001). (4th edition). *The life of Sri Aurobindo.* Pondicherry, India: Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press.

Rishabachand. (1993). *The integral yoga of Sri Aurobindo.* Twin Lakes, WI:

Lotus Press.
Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. (Eds). (2000). Symposium on globalization and education. *Educational Theory, 50*(4).
Satprem. (Trans. Luc Venet). (1984). *Sri Aurobindo or the adventure of consciousness.* New York: The Institute for Evolutionary Research.
Satprem. (Trans. Luc Venet). (1985). *On the way to supermanhood.* New York: The Institute for Evolutionary Research.
Sethna, K.D. (1973). *Teilhard de Chardin and Sri Aurobindo. A focus on fundamentals.* India: Bharatiya Vidya Prakasan.
Sethna, K.D. (1981). *The spirituality of the future: A search apropos of R.C. Zaehner's study on Sri Aurobindo and Teilhard de Chardin.* London, UK: Associated University Press.
Singh, K. (1989). *The prophet of Indian nationalism.* India: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
Steger, M. B. (2001). *Globalization: The new market ideology*. New York: Rowan & Littlefield.
Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton.
Stromquist, N. P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.
Stromquist, N.P., & Monkman, K. (Eds). (2000). *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Susai, A. (1993). *The neo-Hindu concept of man: In the light of Sri Aurobindo's evolutionary vision.* New Delhi, India: Intercultural Publications.
Varma, V.P. (1998). *The political philosophy of Sri Aurobindo*. India: Motilal Banarsidas.
Vrekehm, G.V. (1998). *Beyond the human species: The Life and work of Sri Aurobindo and the Mother*. St. Paul, MN: Paragon House.
Wygant Jr., W.E. (2001). *Of one blood: A study of the parallels in Christianity and Sri Aurobindo's integral philosophy.* Haverford, PA: Buy Books.
Zaehner, R.C. (1971). Evolution in religion: A study of Teilhard de Chardin and Sri Aurobindo. Oxford, OK: Clarendon Press.

Appendix

DIAGRAM 1: Aurobindoian Idea of Global Psyche-Social Evolution

HUMAN SOLIDARITY and GLOBAL UNITY
(The Ultimacy of Globalization)

Absolute Reality—Supramind
(Evolution of Collective Global Consciouosness)

Over-Mind (transitional evolutionary state)

Metaphysical Realm (Higher consciousness/spiritual) — *Intuitive Mind*

Intellectual Realm (Psyche-social) — *Illuminated Mind*

Higher Mind (transitional evolutionary state)

Life Realm (Biological) — *Vital Mind*

Material Realm (Physical) — *Physical Mind*

EVOLUTION OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Book Review:

Educating Citizens for Global Awareness

Nel Noddings, Editor

New York: Teachers College Press, 2005

Reviewed by Reese H. Todd
Texas Tech University

In an era of narrowed curriculum, can educators turn away from the notion of citizenship education as preparing students to succeed in a *competitive* world and prepare students, instead, for successful living in a *cooperative* world? The collection of essays in Nel Noddings' book investigates issues relevant to such an approach to citizenship education. Authors address issues of gender, conflict resolution, home places, cultural citizenship, international history, religious pluralism, and a vision for 21st century educators. They offer insights for refocusing citizenship education with an intentional care for both people and ideas. The collection of essays reflects a theme from the U.N. Women's conference in Beijing (1995) that is consistent with Noddings' own work in the areas of moral education, ethics of care, and gender perspectives. As Peggy McIntosh explains in her essay, at the Forum there was "a sense of a shared and global agenda." That sense is evident in *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness* as authors imagine communities of care at the local, national, and international levels.

Three particular issues in the collection sparked further consideration for me as a teacher educator to understand that shared and global agenda. One was engaging students in the discussion of history as an evolving story in global citizenship. A second issue used the concept of cultural citizenship to explore the complexity of multiple cultural and national identities. The third issue dealt with the shared environment in learning to care for physical places and remembered places. It also raised the question for thoughtful citizens: What is

the role of home places that connect people to the Earth and to their heritage?

First, Stephen Thornton's essay reminds us that world history is a shared and ongoing story. The end of the story is not yet written, but it does include people from many nations. So, he integrates international perspectives into the study of U. S. history by inviting students to participate in historical events as decision-makers and analysts. For example, he shows the events that precipitated World War I began as an international event in the Balkans long before U. S. troops entered the war. Then, following the war, what was seen as a peaceful solution, cost one group its homeland and re-emerged as ethnic conflicts in the late 20th century. The relationships among groups of people in the region continue to impact the global community. He explains that events have relevance to students when issues that affect nations on a global level are seen at a national and local level. His point is that history does not need to be taught as a completed event with details students absorb from an expert's interpretation. Rather, events in history can be taught through the lens of a shared, global agenda. Educating students for global awareness includes knowledge of events past and present as students seek solutions for justice and peace for multiple cultural groups. Thornton proposes that student content knowledge should lead to some kind of engaging educational activity, perhaps conflict resolution as Stacie Nicole Smith and David Fairman suggest in another of the essays. They give a classroom example of conflict resolution successfully infused into the curriculum.

A second issue concerned with a shared and global agenda is found in the essay by Gloria Ladsen-Billings, who asks, "Who does your school think you are?" Although school curriculum treats all students as if they were White, middle-class, and native-born, demographics show that is not true in many of the nation's public schools. Ladsen-Billings reminds us of our "cultural citizenship" whereby we identify ourselves individually and collectively as members of cultural groups that may overlap with multiple civic identities. Latina students are not just from Mexico but are also U. S. citizens, scholars, and valued friends. My identity as a teacher educator at a large university is set aside when I am a worker in an international construction project. I recognize the privilege associated with a U. S. passport as well as my second-class citizenship as a woman in some other places. Do we also recognize the multiple faces of our students as global citizens and how their cultural experiences shape learning about the local, national, and international environment? Do we have a moral obligation to respond when some students gain access to resources while

others are denied access because of unequal power relationships among groups?

Family friends share a humorous story about their overlapping cultural citizenship. As young adults they were responding to a census survey interview. They claimed Czechoslovakian heritage on their mother's side of the family, and traditional Chinese roots from their father's family who had migrated to Hawaii. The siblings had always lived in the central United States. In answer to ethnic heritage question, Keith replied, "We are Chinese Czechers." Now where did that fit on the reporting form?

Robert Nash further contributes to the discussion of cultural citizenship with his essay on religious pluralism. He noted that while religion is a fundamental part of human existence in cultures around the globe, conversations with students show that many are not even knowledgeable of the history of their own religion. Is it the U. S. commitment to separation of church and state in government structure that closes dialogue? Do we deny the mix of religion with politics, geography, and economics and then fail to recognize the importance of religion among peoples around the globe whose government is based on an integration of church and state, religion and politics?

A third issue in the essays concerns the shared, global environment and the places we choose to preserve. Noddings explains that places provoke strong memories of a family's history and culture. When people are forcibly displaced from their homes, the generational memory extends beyond the immediate family. It bonds those with common experiences and forges a strong national identity. In time, the home place memory may become a catalyst for national struggle that transcends political borders and physical boundaries. Educating for global awareness includes acquiring knowledge of political conflicts and developing interpersonal skills for listening to the stories of people who have lived in the midst of significant historical events.

In a concluding essay, Nancy Carlsson-Paige and Linda Lantieri ask, "What, then, is the role of schools in preparing young people to see themselves as part of this larger whole that includes not just their neighborhood, community, or country, but the world" (p. 110)? The narrowing of the curriculum means that teachers are the ones to take the responsibility to create windows to a larger world. The contributing authors raise questions that help teachers broaden the curriculum to greater awareness and invite us to imagine a gentler, caring community in which people listen to the issues affecting neighbors. When we foster in learners an attitude of interest in the array of beliefs and values found in cultural regions on the Earth, we plant sustainable seeds of global

awareness with young people. With the insights found in the collection of essays, educators can reshape understanding of citizenship in the 21st century into a cooperative, relational, and caring vision for a more peaceful global environment.

Book Review:

Fundamentals of Curriculum: Passion and Professionalism (2nd Edition) By Decker Walker

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003

Reviewed by William Hull
Texas Tech University

Many curriculum textbooks focus on curriculum design and evaluation, or provide practical tools for the practitioner; few textbooks provide both. The textbook, *Fundamentals of Curriculum: Passion and Professionalism* second edition (2003) by Decker Walker, seeks to fill this gap. The design structure of *Fundamentals of Curriculum* is set up under two broad themes: perspectives and practice. This structure is useful for the seasoned professional curriculum designer and evaluator, as well as the novice curriculum user. One problem with deciding on what curriculum to teach is that there are unavoidable consequences of marginalizing something simply because it is left out; however the constraints on resources dictate that something must be left out. Furthermore the problem of not teaching enough of a curriculum can create its own societal problems. Walker does a good job of positioning the question of what to teach with the balance of what not to teach, the implications of both, and how societal influences guide these decisions. He also indicates that stability in society makes these curriculum decisions difficult; stating "social and cultural change make the curriculum problem hard" (page xiii).

Walker positions the importance of curriculum planning and theory in the context of "the heartbeat of American society." The author specifically states that this book is for anyone who has already had some experience with curriculum, especially the curriculum professional, developer or reformer. However, the book is for anyone with an interest in curriculum and it offers practical tools along with historical and theoretical foundations for developing a strong, rich curriculum.

In the introduction of *Fundamentals of Curriculum*, Walker explains the uniqueness of this textbook. Walker's first edition attempted to be broad enough yet specific enough that graduate students, teachers, and professionals would all benefit. The first edition, according to Walker, was the culmination of over ten years of teaching and practice. There are four characteristics that the author indicates are unique to this text; it is comprehensive, rigorous, practical, and professional. Walker suggests that the book attempts to be comprehensive in that it acquaints the reader with the various "schools of thought, the major value systems, the major lines of activity, and the major forms of inquiry in the field" (page xv). The text is rigorous in several ways; it tackles the most scholarly and rigorous research on curriculum questions while using research and scholarship to ground the discussions of curriculum issues, which, in turn, aids readers in understanding the various aspects of performing rigorous studies of curriculum questions. This rigor is intended to prepare students with the skills required to conduct scholarly studies that meet high standards of inquiry.

The central focus of the book is to weave theoretical frameworks with practical curriculum practice. Hence the author defines curriculum broadly, as "a particular way of ordering content and purposes for teaching and learning in schools" (p. 4). This broad definition is intentional and forms the argument for curriculum negotiation. As such, curriculum becomes the vehicle through which America's identity is shaped; specifically "students will be shaped by the purposes for which we teach a subject as well as by what we teach them" (p. 13). Democratic societies are faced with a smaller core of agreed upon shared values and "a common culture" is more difficult to define. The broad definition also allows for various goals of curriculum. According to Walker, curriculum functions as "a form of ritual that expressed and affirmed the tradition while also functioning as a means for transmitting it" (p. 15).

After the author spends time on defining curriculum, he then details what curriculum specialists do to constantly improve curriculum. This leads to how curricula have changed since the advent of the American School. In this section the author discusses the evolution of curricula and its delivery in schools, as influenced by several specific events—specifically, early social reformists and progressives, Dewey's Progressive Laboratory School at the University of Chicago, The Committee of Ten, and Sputnik. Walker gives a succinct description of how curriculum has evolved over the past 200 years. Many of the events were instrumental in influencing the push toward a national curriculum policy. The National Defense Education Act particularly "funded projects designed to update

content and curriculum materials in science, mathematics, and foreign languages and to train teachers in the new content" (p. 45).

Walker turns from a historical approach in order to contrast progressive and traditional curriculum theories. Consequently, by using actual examples Walker illustrates how curricula differ and under what ideological frameworks they operate; as such, students begin to understand how curriculum theories shape curricular decisions and students begin to understand how to critically analyze a curriculum. New curricular theories are then introduced along with tools for assessing a good curriculum theory. These tools are essential to every student embarking on curriculum design and evaluation, they include: validity (logical, factual, and meaningful), theoretical power, serviceability, and morality.

It would seem like a logical transition to discuss curriculum studies here. However, it appears after a discussion of curriculum reform. Thus, Walker describes curricular research as secondary to the profession, stating "professional practice is primary, and research has value when and if it helps to improve practice" (p. 132). By strategically placing this chapter after curriculum reform, Walker validates the argument that it is through stakeholders that curricular decisions are made--not through research. Although Walker's perspective could be right; the need to substantiate curricular reforms through pertinent research may win more stakeholders than Walker portrays. Walker paints a picture of curricular reform where advocates work through constituents in order to "implement its values and priorities" (p. 117). The system is criticized for its lack of continuity, when compared to centralized education systems, and one that is open to everyone "but in which different students receive different curriculums" (p. 118). Walker approaches multiple methods of curriculum reform to illustrate other possibilities for curriculum policy, such as standards-based reforms, high stakes testing, and accrediting associations. The three research traditions—scientific, humanistic, and practical—of curriculum studies are introduce along with a detailed description of research limitations, making the research more robust, and on interpreting and using findings.

The most exciting and instrumental portions of the text are the practical sections. In these sections (curriculum practice, improving curriculum practice, improving classroom curriculum, and improving school curriculum), Walker provides tools for the seasoned and novice instructor. Practical tips include such topics as: scheduling and pacing activities, selecting and planning activities, bringing the curriculum to life, and motivating students to follow the curriculum through activities that are meaningful to them. Practical tips are also provided for administrators as well, such as staff organization which can encourage

collaboration, or in-services geared to desired curricular improvements. These practical suggestions assist individuals with the delivery of curricular content and provide the necessary tools to reach the students receiving this content or the teachers that are delivering it. Further, approaches to improving the curriculum are provided using examples in practice, specifically, practical reasoning through deliberation. Both methods are highlighted and examples of each to improve the curriculum are explored. Best of all, Walker cautions the reader that "deliberation only leads to improvement under certain conditions" (p. 234) and these caveats are detailed to help the reader understand the difficulty in fair deliberation that can actually improve the curriculum.

Walker's text is an excellent introductory tool for understanding the scope of curriculum design, evaluation and theory. Students will be able to understand the foundations of curriculum, through Walker's historical analysis, the theoretical underpinnings connected to curriculums, and methodologies for curriculum evaluation. However, more importantly, students will be able to practice curriculum delivery and improve their expertise in real settings. As such, these practical tools may develop the necessary skills that curriculum theorists and researchers need to become experts in the field of curriculum development and evaluation.

Contributing Authors

Michael Bentley, Ed. D., retired in 2006 from the science education faculty of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. His 37-year career has included teaching at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels as well as work in science museum education, school administration, and state-level curriculum supervision. His interests include the nature of science as applied to K-12 curriculum, and international education. His latest book is *Teaching Constructivist Science, K–8: Nurturing Natural Investigators in the Standards-Based Classroom* (2007, Corwin Press). He can be found on the Web at http://web.utk.edu/~mbentle1

Curtis Bradley is an assistant professor of physics at The Petroleum Institute in Abu Dhabi, UAE. His research interests include: particulate detection and characterization, laser cooling and atom trapping, gravimetry and—of special interest to this issue—realistic simulations for improved learning in physics.

Stephen C. Fleury is a professor of education at Le Moyne College in Syracuse, New York. He has a Ph.D. in social studies/teacher education from Syracuse University, and was a middle-school social studies teacher. He is currently a school board member for a rural district, and co-director of the Syracuse Center for Urban Education. He has numerous publications which share, at root, an examination of the relationships between knowledge(s) and action, and the intermediary role of education in these relationships.

Jim Garrison is a professor of philosophy of education at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, Virginia. His work concentrates on American pragmatism, especially the philosophy of John Dewey. Jim is a past winner of the Jim Merritt award for his scholarship in the philosophy of education and president-elect of the John Dewey Society.

Ian Gibson holds the Vincent Fairfax Family Foundation Chair in Education at Macquarie University, Australia, leading the Teachers for the Future initiative and is President of the Society for Technology and Teacher Education (SiTE). His focus is on research, learning, leading, and teaching in technology-rich, global learning environments. He publishes and has received awards, honors, and grants in these areas.

Jonathan Gratch works out of the Watkins Research Department at Texas Christian University.

William Hull is a Ph.D. student and a research assistant in curriculum and instruction in the College of Education at Texas Tech University. His research focuses on self-efficacy beliefs that influence students, educational technology integration, and program evaluation. He is currently serving as a Helen DeVitt Jones fellow in the Curriculum and Instruction Program.

Vincent E. Izuegbu recently completed his Ph.D. at the University of Illinois at Chicago and currently teaches the 7th grade at Wells Preparatory Academy. His research interests revolve around curriculum theory, and in particular, he explores connections between life and curriculum.

Janet Kelly is an associate professor in the College of Education at Texas Christian University. She is also the director of the Institute of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education.

Andrew Koenigs is associate superintendent for the Andover Public Schools, a suburban school district outside of Wichita, Kansas. Dr. Koenigs has over 20 years of experience as a high school math teacher and as an administrator in Kansas public schools. His interests are in-service teacher professional development.

Richard G. Lyons is a faculty member at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell.

Robert Maninger is an assistant professor in the College of Education at Texas Christian University where he specializes in technology applications in education, trends and issues in administration, and in educational psychology.

Jack Martin is a Burnaby Mountain Endowed Professor in the Faculty of Education at Simon Fraser in Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

Work on his article within this issue of *The Journal of Thought* was supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Michael Maurer is principal of Haysville Middle School in the Haysville School District, located in South Central Kansas. It is the largest middle school in the state of Kansas. Dr. Maurer has over 20 years experience as a teacher and administrator in Kansas public schools.

Jean A. Patterson is an associate professor and graduate coordinator in the Department of Educational Leadership at Wichita State University. Her research interests include the study of complex organizations, educational policy, equity and social justice, and qualitative research methodologies.

David Pickus is an honors faculty fellow at Arizona State University. Originally from Chicago, he received a B.A. in history from Lawrence University, and earned his Ph.D. in German intellectual history from the University of Chicago in 1995. An expanded version of his thesis was published as a book *Dying with an Enlightening Fall: Poland in the Eyes of German Intellectuals, 1764-1800* (Lexington Books, 2001).

Gladys Ritterhouse is a doctoral candidate in the Educational Leadership Program at Wichita State University. She is presently chair of the Sterling College Teacher Education Program, located in Sterling, Kansas. She has almost 30 years of experience as a special education teacher, elementary principal, and director of special education.

Charles Stockton is special assistant to the superintendent of the Springfield Public Schools in Springfield, Missouri. He has over 20 years of experience as a teacher, principal, and district administrator in Kansas and Missouri schools. His interests are effective professional development models.

Mary Jo Taylor is the superintendent of the Stafford Public Schools in rural Kansas. She has over 25 years of experience as a high school social studies teacher and high school principal. Her specific educational interests include school improvement by community building and providing the highest quality of education to students in a rural setting.

Reese H. Todd is an assistant professor in the College of Education at Texas Tech University. Her research interests include social studies

education with a particular emphasis in geography literacy and global awareness, community service-learning, and teacher education.

Stephen R. White, D.A., is an assistant professor in the Reich College of Education at Appalachian State University. He is particularly interested in reconstructionism, which conceptualizes education as a vehicle for social engineering through developing a collective consciousness of social cooperation at global levels.

Journal of Thought

Volume 42, Numbers 3 & 4

Fall-Win 2007

Journal of Thought